L'Espionage Magazine

Volume Seven: Fall 2024

L'Espionage Magazine Volume Seven: Fall 2024

© Obelisk Press of Vancouver, 2024

All rights reserved.

This magazine or any part thereof must not be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the magazine Editorial Board.

Cover picture: President Reagan, Speech at the Berlin Wall, June 12, 1987

If you have a submission for the ***L'Espionage Magazine*** feel free to contact the Editor in Chief at

lespionage.magazine @ gmail.com.

Table of Content

L'Espionage Magazine Welcomes Submissions 5

Contemporary Affairs 6

Port Facilities Damaged in Strikes Raising Fears for Grain Exports 7

Pulling On the Gordion Knot by Henry Halliday 11

Is it Time for Russian Women to Leave Russia? by Sedyye Volosy 16

Out in Force by Sergey Radchenkov 19

Joe Rogan- the Propagandist 21

Chinese Drone Companies Targeted By Latest U.S. Sanctions 24

EU To Target Chinese Firms for Aiding Russia In Ukraine 27

Articles about True Events 30

President Reagan's Address to British Parliament in London, UK 31

President Reagan's, Evil Empire Speech 48

President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative 64

Ronald Reagan Address at the Brandenburg Gate Berlin 82

History 93

The RCN and the Cuban Missile Crisis by Andrew Pye 94

Analysis 110

North Korea sent 100 ballistic missiles to Russia: Ukraine 111

Russia Bans 'Child-Free Propaganda' 115

Tradecraft 118

Russian Farmers Ditch Wheat for Other Crops after Heavy Losses 119

Was the USSR Producing Enough Food? by James David 124

Stagnant Grain Production in Russia by William Webster 144

Science and Technology 148

Nuclear War Should Require a Second Opinion …..... 149

"The accumulated food cost inflation rate in Russia since 2021 is the highest in the G20 and stands at over 35 %. The inflation rate in Russia at the present time is a national secret. If a Russian were to publish such data they woud be arrested and sent to a gulag."

William Webster

L'Espionage Magazine Welcomes Submissions

Obelisk Press of Vancouver is pleased to publish the eighth edition of ***L'Espionage Magazine***.

This edition features some of the landmark speeches by Prsident Ronald Reagan. There is an article about the Royal Canadian Navy and the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. There is a section that looks at Russian grain production duing the Soviet era and in the present day. An article by William Webster provides some insight into Putin's decision to invade Ukraine as a way of trying to dominate world wheat production. In 2025 it appears that Russian wheat exports may be reduced by 2/3 year to deal with stagnating or plummeting Russian grain production.

The ***L'Espionage Magazine*** board is comprised of the unpaid volunteers: Please feel free to send your short story, essays or article submissions to the Editor in Chief at

Lespionage.magazine @ gmail.com.

There is no fee to submit. There is no writer's fee provided by the journal for those who submit. The publishing rights remain with the writer.

Contemporary Affairs

Port Facilities Damaged in Strikes Raising Fears for Grain Exports

[**Brussels**] Euronews Nov. 24, 2024

Ukraine, known as the *Breadbasket of Europe*, is a major global supplier of grain and before the Russian invasion it regularly exported around six million tonnes of grain every month from its Black Sea ports.

Ukraine's President Volodymyr Zelenskyy has said 321 port facilities have been damaged in Russian drone and missile strikes since last July, potentially hindering Ukraine's ability export its grain to countries around the world.

"Ukrainian food exports provide food for 400 million people in 100 countries around the world. Food prices in Egypt, Libya, Nigeria and other countries in Africa directly depend on whether farmers and agricultural companies in Ukraine can operate normally," Zelenskyy said.

"That is why it is so important that we continue to stand together in protecting food security, the security of routes, supplies, food and other critical export goods."

Zelenskyy was speaking at the third Grain from Ukraine summit in Kyiv, a humanitarian food programme launched by Zelenskyy in 2022.

The goal of the programme is to emphasise Ukraine's role as a responsible member of the world community and to counter Russian propaganda that blames Ukraine and its Western partners for the food crisis.

"Destroying Ukraine's ability to supply grain means millions are left without food. No one can close their eyes and pretend this doesn't concern them. Global food security is under attack and ignoring it will only make the crisis worse. This war is a global issue and it demands a global response," said the Czech Republic's Foreign Minister, Jan Lipavský.

The Breadbasket of Europe

Ukraine, known as the Breadbasket of Europe, is a major global supplier of grain and before the Russian invasion it regularly exported around six million tonnes of grain every month from its Black Sea ports.

When Russia invaded in February 2022, it blockaded the Black Sea ports and grain exports collapsed sparking a global food security crisis.

But in July 2022, shipments of grain resumed under the Black Sea Grain Initiative, a deal mediated by the United Nations and Türkiye.

But that success was short-lived with Russia exiting the pact a year later, claiming provisions in the deal covering its own exports of grain and fertilizer weren't being honoured.

Since then, Ukraine has continued to export grain along its own sea corridor established in July 2023.

That passes through the territorial waters of Türkiye, Bulgaria and Romania but damage to port infrastructure from ongoing strikes in the Black Sea region has raised concerns about how effectively Ukraine can ship that grain.

Russia has repeatedly denied launching attacks on any civilian infrastructure in Ukraine.

"To enslave Ukraine and destroy the existing world order, the Putin regime, like the totalitarian Stalinist regime, has taken up the cause of Ukrainian grain. Putin has turned the threat of famine into a weapon, seeking to cause a global food crisis and famine," said Ukraine's Foreign Minister, Andrii Sybiha.

"The military invasion of Ukraine, energy blackmail of Europe and a grain blockade for the global south, especially Africa, were and are part of the Russian plan."

The Czech Foreign Minister was the only foreign representative to attend the summit in person, but many others appeared via video call.

Estonian President Alar Karis said Russia's aggressive war is also a war against millions of other people around the world who do not have enough food.

While in her call, Swiss President Viola Amherst said the grain initiative was a demonstration of the strength of solidarity of Ukrainians.

But data from traders and the Ukrainian government show Ukraine's grain exports in the 2024/2025 season amounted to almost 16 million metric tonnes, up from 11 million tonnes in the same period the previous year.

Pulling On the Gordion Knot by *Henry Halliday*

[**London**] It is clear that Europe has a direct interest in the outcome of the conflict in Ukraine. It is also clear that this outcome is of greater impact and importance to Europe, than to the incoming Trump Administration.

I make a distinction between America and its President. The recent US election have shifted the political spectrum somewhat to the Right. It will be interesting how this shift affects Europe in the next few years.

Turn back the clock a hundred years and you have a similar political landscape, with the Poles beating back the Bolsheviks at the Gates of Warsaw. A century ago you saw a Post Wilsonian era, with strident isolationism orchestrated by the Republican Party of Taft and Co. Historians will tell you that US isolationism inevitably led to World War Two.

Today, London is somewhere between the two ends of a Gordion knot that will soon be pulled beginning in January 2025, when the second Trump administration enters office. In our recent General Election here in the United Kingdom we voted out a Conservative Government and voted in a Labour Government.

Should we hold onto the rope?

It is understood that TRUMP's *Make America Great Again* mantra is somewhat isolationist, and Trumps own predisposition to authoritarianism

leads one to speculate what impact this will have on the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth. His views of the world will clearly have an effect on the European Union.

What hangs in the balance for Europe is not merely the outcome of the present conflict in Ukraine. What hangs in the balance is what an assuaged and ascending Russia might have in store for Europe. Putin is keen to rebuild what he perceives as the past glories of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Putin is doing this at whatever the cost to the Russian people, which in over two years of conflict has meant 150,000 killed and 350,000 wounded, the loss of trade with Western countries, the loss or destruction of perhaps $ 1 trillion USD of Russian war material, and a present day inflation rate of over 20%. Much of the economic growth that Russia has accumulated over 30 years of peace (1992-2022) has also been flittered away.

Upwards of a million military draft age young men have fled Russia. Young women in Russia have decided to forego marriage and children in light of Putin's policies. Recently the Russian Duma has passed legislation meant to punish any Russia who advocates childfree policies (suggesting Russian women forego having children). In a shockingly sexist view of things in the lead up to the waggish 2024 Russian Presidential election Putin declared the women's primary role in a *Patriotic Russia* is to have babies – *at least seven of them*!

Perhaps it is now time for a million Russian women to flee Putin's Russia to join the million lonely men who have fled Russian to escape Putin's draft..

Now it appears the world has book ends … it will be interesting to see how this plays out. The last time Putin and Trump met face to face was in 2018 in Helsinki and not much came out of their meeting. When and where they might meet face to face for their next meeting is worthy of betting odds. Need we be reminded that there are international warrants out for the arrest of President Putin.

The new Trump administration should not take it for granted that they have London and Brussels ready to follow their lead. The European Union's GDP is comparable to that of the United States, and together the UK and Commonwealth has a GDP 2/3 that of the United States. To put things into context, the GDP of the PRC is only 2/3rd that of the US or EU. Russia's GDP is less than that of the UK or even Canada.

It is clear what impact isolationism from a second Trump Administration will have on Europe. Donald Trump wishes a speedy end to the conflict in Ukraine. Whether this is achieved through earnest diplomacy, or whether this will be by '*diktat*,' is left to be seen. One scenario is that the European Union will take on the symbolic role of supporting Ukraine logistically until the coffers start to run dry, then will ease to some state of extended and meaningless attrition.

Russia in turn has been availing itself with assistance from its authoritarian allies China, Iran and North Korea and have been bombarding Ukraine with missiles at an ever increasing rate. But the fighting on the ground has become

almost First World War in nature. Neither side has a definitive edge in the day to day fighting, but the Russian bear has more resources and an indifference to death and suffering.

And where does the UK stand in all this. Trump is no fan of the United Kingdom and its institutions. On his previous visits to the UK he went out of his way to deliberately disrespect her majesty Queen Elizabeth II. He has a greater indifference to King Charles III.

The first time an American Presient addressed the UK Parliament was when President Reagan spoke in 1982. This is in marked contrast to previous presidents, in particular President Reagan and Donald Trump. In his June 1982 speech to the House of Commons Westminster, Mr. Reagan praised the close and special relationship that the US and UK had fostered over many decades. It is worth noting that this speech was the first by a sitting US President to the House of Commons Westminster.

I doubt that Donald Trump has ever carefully read President Reagan's speech. By his actions it appears he does not view the UK as an equal to the United States in the fashion that Mr. Reagan did.

It is worth noting that Trump was not invited to address the UK parliament during his first term in office from 2016 to 2020. It will be interesting to see when the new UK Labour Prime Minister invites Donald Trump to address Parliament.

There is a rumor going around London that the UK Prime Minister is contemplating invited President Trump to give an address to a joint session of the House of Commons Westminster sometime in 2025.

The last time a US President addressed the House of Commons was on the 25th of May, 2011 when US President and 2009 Nobel Peace Prize winner Barack Obama came for a state visit.

What is the expression … 'a lot of water has flowed under Westminster bridge since then …'

Is it Time for Russian Women to Leave Russia? by Sedyye Volosy

[**St. Petersburg**] Since President Putin began his unnecessary "special operations" on Ukraine in February 2022 almost a million Russian men and women have left for 'a life' outside of Russia. About 700,000 of these emigres are military service eligible men.

When you analyze closely how President Putin is conducting his "special operations" you realize that it is through his contacts at the FSB. We Russians aren't allowed to describe this operation in any other '*way'* without running the risk of being arrested and sent to prison. Nor are we allowed to ask simple questions like "why?"

Today what Russia is experiencing is like turning the clock back a century ago to the economic turmoil and inflation of the 1920's. Given the increase in the price of food it is not too hard to estimate what the inflation rate is at the moment in St. Petersburg.

Those of us who are old enough to remember the Brezhnev era realize that things were much better even a half-century ago. Inflation then was non-existent, merely because so were the consumer goods, none existent. But at least we could put food on our tables. Today, here in St. Petersburg, *фарцовка* is back and is more rampant than it was fifty years ago.

It was during the Brezhnev era, my that my children were born, grew up and were happy and healthy. My children had a better life than I had. But today

my granddaughters cannot live here in Russia. They expect a better life than the one their parents had.

Of the 700,000 men who have emigrated, man who now reside in Europe, most will not return to Russia in the foreseeable future, or at least until the conflict in Ukraine ends. For many of these men they are struggling with unemployment, ostracization, isolation and loneliness.

I have a grand daughter who recently decided to join her partner and has left home. She took a circuitous route through Dubai and then to a destination in Europe. We don't know if we will ever see her again. Her boyfriend comes from Moscow. The two of them aren't married but are already sharing a bed.

I have another grand-daughter who is at school in North America. She went to high school abroad and is now in university in England. She recently wrote us to say that she may not return home. Her love interest is not Russian but someone she has met at school. They are already shared a bed.

I have told both my granddaughters … who am I to be the judge … a baby is, after all, a gift from God. It would be nice to have great grandchildren.

The plight of my two granddaughters got me thinking about the many lonely Russian men scattered throughout Europe. Most likely they will not find European girlfriends given the stigma of 'being Russian."

This leads me to a simple conclusion … perhaps a half million Russian women, age 20 to 30, might pack their bags and venture in search of a mate somewhere in the quiet corners of Europe. Together they can have a family in peace knowing their sons will not die needlessly at war.

It is most likely they already know many of the men who sit home sick and lonely and craving a "*Tasty Vareniki*."

Out in Force by Sergey Radchenkov

{*Dr. Radchenkov is with the Henry A. Kissinger Center for Global Affairs at Johns Hopkins University, Washington*}

While Russia's invasion of Ukraine appeared to herald the return to hard power to global politics, it had, in a sense, never gone away. For all of the emphasis in recent years on economic and technological competition, military force remains in use, not least by the US in its long wars in the Middle East. But the appeal of a major conventional land war had faded to the point of preposterousness, certainly in Europe – until Vladimir Putin broke the taboo.

Russia has long been a mid-ranking economic power, its weak economy sustained by oil and gas exports. But in military terms, it considered itself – and was widely believed to be – a major global player. That was why its invasion of Ukraine sent shockwaves around the world. Would other great powers, notably China, follow Russia's lead in pivoting to hard power and, if they did, could it mean a replay of the 20th century with its destructive global wars?

Fortunately, Russia's reliance on hard power has backfired. Its defeats in Ukraine at the hands of a supposedly second-rate army highlight the fact that Putin, much like many Western observers, overestimated his country's capabilities and underestimated Ukraine's. Of course, Ukraine has relied heavily on Western support, which partly redeems the value of hard military

power, for if Kyiv did not counter Russian force with its own, the country would have been overrun in days.

Yet there is a broader issue at stake. What did Russia gain from its misadventures? Its humbling has reduced its global stature, cutting it down to size. Western economic sanctions caused severe disruption to the country's economy, raising grave doubts about its ability to compete in the long term. Moscow lost much of its economic leverage in Europe as its erstwhile partners on the continent sought rapid decoupling, especially in the energy sector. The Kremlin became far more dependent on China's good graces.

Russia's hopes of exercising any form of residual influence in Ukraine has been dashed. Far from showing its viability of hard power, Russia has demonstrated its limitations. It is a lesson that other would-be disruptors of the global order would be wise to heed.

{first published in *Monocle*, Jan. 2023}

Joe Rogan- the Propagandist

Joe Rogan was labeled an apologist for Vladimir Putin by a Ukrainian boxing legend and brother of the mayor of Kyiv on Sunday [Nov. 23, 2024].

It follows a sensational assertion by the podcaster, UFC commentator and fervent supporter of President-elect Donald Trump that the actions of President Joe Biden could lead to an escalation of the raging fighting with Russia and even start World War III.

Rogan made his hot-button comments last week after Biden gave Ukraine permission to use long-range U.S.-supplied missiles that can strike deep into Russia amid the on-going conflict.

He also placed blame with Ukraine President Volodymyr Zelensky.

“Zelensky says Putin is terrified. F--- you, man... f--- you, people,” Rogan said. “You people are about to start World War III.”

He pointed the finger at Biden, exclaiming, “Maybe that would be a good thing we would like to avoid from a dying former president.”

On Sunday, Wladimir Klitschko, 48—a Ukrainian former world heavyweight champion—posted a video to X where he took issue at Rogan for spreading “Russian propaganda.”

The 48-year-old, who last fought professionally in 2017, accused the podcast host of "using the only weapon that (Vladimir) Putin really intends to use." His brother, Vitali Klitschko, another former world heavyweight champion, is mayor of Kyiv.

"Joe Rogan, I listened to your latest podcast. I am sending you this video to let you know that I disagree," Klitschko said. "You talk about these American weapons being sent to Ukraine, which you believe will lead to the Third World War.

"So, let me tell you that you're repeating Russian propaganda—Putin's Russia is in trouble. So they want to scare you and people like you. His war was supposed to last three days, it has lasted three years thanks to the heroism and sacrifice of us Ukrainians.

"Putin's Russia wants to destroy Ukraine quietly, they want America to stay quiet–not great. A great America is not an America that abandons countries that defend freedom with their lives."

Klitschko offered to be a guest on The Joe Rogan Experience so "we could discuss like free men."

The X account for the Joe Rogan podcast subsequently tweeted in response: "Does this make sense to anyone or just an attempt to get on the podcast?" Billionaire Bill Ackman urged the show to have Klitschko appear. "Yea. You should have him on," he replied.

In another post, the account replied: “People are big mad.”

Biden is allowing Kyiv to use the sophisticated Army Tactical Missile System, or ATACMs. In recent weeks Putin has enlisted help from thousands of troops from North Korea.

“How are you allowed to do that when you’re on your way out?” Rogan said of Biden, who will leave office in January.

“There should be some sort of pause for significant actions that could potentially start World War III.”

Meanwhile, Trump insists he will bring an end to the war within days of taking office in January.

{first published by David Thompson on *Daily Beast*}

Chinese Drone Companies Targeted By Latest U.S. Sanctions

Radio Free Europe Oct. 17

The United States on October 17 imposed sanctions on two Chinese companies and an affiliated Russian company involved in making and shipping drones Russia has used in its full-scale war in Ukraine.

The two Chinese companies designated by the U.S. Treasury Department are Xiamen Limbach Aircraft Engine Company and the Redlepus Vector Industry Shenzhen.

Xiamen Limbach Aircraft Engine Company makes an engine that powers Russia's Garpiya series long-range unmanned aerial vehicles, the U.S. Treasury Department said. Redlepus Vector Industry Shenzhen is involved in shipping the attack drones, the department said in a statement.

A Russian national and a Russian company affiliated with the two Chinese companies also were designated in the sanctions announced on October 17. They are Artem Yamshchikov, general director and beneficial owner of TSK Vektor, which serves as an intermediary between a previously designated Russian company and the China-based suppliers for Russia's Garpiya project.

Yamshikov also directs and owns Limited Liability Company Trading House Vector, the Russian affiliate that was designated for sanctions in the October 17 announcement.

The Treasury Department said the new sanctions are the first U.S. sanctions imposed on Chinese entities that produce complete weapons systems in partnership with Russian firms. Previously imposed sanctions on Chinese entities have targeted those that provided components critical to Russia's military-industrial base.

"Russia increasingly relies on the expertise of foreign professionals and the import of sophisticated technologies to sustain its weapons program and advance its military campaign against Ukraine," said Acting Undersecretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence Bradley T. Smith. "We will continue to disrupt the networks that enable Russia's acquisition and use of these advanced weapons."

The Garpiya has been deployed by Russia in its brutal war against Ukraine, destroying critical infrastructure and causing mass casualties, the Treasury Department said.

The drone was designed and developed by China-based experts and is produced at factories within China in collaboration with Russian defense firms before they are transferred to Russia for use against Ukraine, according to the department.

The sanctions freeze any assets held by the individuals and companies in U.S. jurisdiction and bar U.S. persons from conducting business with them.

EU To Target Chinese Firms for Aiding Russia In Ukraine

[**Radio Free Europe**] Nov. 25, 2024

The European Union has proposed for the first time to target Chinese companies and individuals with visa bans and asset freezes over their dealings with Russian firms linked to Moscow's war effort in Ukraine, according to RFE/RL.

The new measures, which are laid out in a draft proposal reviewed by RFE/RL, are part of a proposed 15th sanctions package recently put forward by Brussels that aims to target six China-based companies with asset freezes and one Chinese citizen with a visa ban, among other entities.

While the EU has hit Chinese entities in the past with sanctions as part of Brussels' effort to curtail evasion, those measures have consisted of bans that prevent EU companies from having business dealings with those firms. This proposal marks the first effort to blacklist Chinese companies or individuals with visa bans and asset freezes over helping Russia procure dual-use goods that can be used on the battlefield.

If approved, such a move would prevent individuals associated with the company from entering the EU and would freeze each firm's EU-based funds.

The draft sanctions package comes as Russia has managed to overcome sweeping EU and U.S. technology sanctions aimed at stifling its military-

industrial complex by rerouting crucial goods like microprocessors through friendly third countries or sourcing from them directly.

China, in particular, has played a leading role in boosting Russia's economy since its February 2022 invasion of Ukraine and Western officials have said that Chinese support in circumventing sanctions has had a major effect in helping Moscow on the battlefield.

The only Chinese individual proposed for a visa ban is a "Chinese businessperson" that represents a firm engaged in mainland China and Hong Kong, the draft document states, which has "infringed prohibitions against circumvention of the EU's restrictive measures regime imposed on the Russian Federation," including companies that are part of Russia's military-industrial complex.

The proposed document lists 54 persons for visa bans and 29 entities for asset freezes in total, the majority of which are based in Russia and are Russian citizens.

Among the six firms based in China or Hong Kong that are proposed for asset freezes, one of them is owned by a Russian national.

The company, the draft document states, "has been the largest supplier of sanctioned microelectronic components to Russian companies since the beginning of the war of aggression against Ukraine, which are used for the

fabrication of Orlan drones which are used by the Russian military in Ukraine."

In addition to the asset freezes and visa bans, the new package also takes aim at 33 companies mostly based in Russia that are under export restrictions, but also includes firms based in China, Iran, Thailand, and the United Arab Emirates.

The document also lists 44 entities as part of an effort to impose sanctions on Russia's so-called "shadow fleet," the term meant to refer to ships that are engaged in illegal operations for the purposes of circumventing sanctions.

The draft version of the sanctions package was first shared with EU countries on November 22 and would still need to be approved by all 27 member states in order to come into effect.

{article written and first published by Reid Standish at RFE}

Articles about True Events

President Reagan's Address to British Parliament in London, UK

June 8, 1982

My Lord Chancellor, Mr. Speaker:

The journey of which this visit forms a part is a long one. Already it has taken me to two great cities of the West, Rome and Paris, and to the economic summit at Versailles. And there, once again, our sister democracies have proved that even in a time of severe economic strain, free peoples can work together freely and voluntarily to address problems as serious as inflation, unemployment, trade, and economic development in a spirit of cooperation and solidarity.

Other milestones lie ahead. Later this week, in Germany, we and our NATO allies will discuss measures for our joint defense and America's latest initiatives for a more peaceful, secure world through arms reductions.

Each stop of this trip is important, but among them all, this moment occupies a special place in my heart and in the hearts of my countrymen -- a moment of kinship and homecoming in these hallowed halls.

Speaking for all Americans, I want to say how very much at home we feel in your house. Every American would, because this is, as we have been so eloquently told, one of democracy's shrines. Here the rights of free people and the processes of representation have been debated and refined.

It has been said that an institution is the lengthening shadow of a man. This institution is the lengthening shadow of all the men and women who have sat here and all those who have voted to send representatives here.

This is my second visit to Great Britain as President of the United States. My first opportunity to stand on British soil occurred almost a year and a half ago when your Prime Minister graciously hosted a diplomatic dinner at the British Embassy in Washington. Mrs. Thatcher said then that she hoped I was not distressed to find staring down at me from the grand staircase a portrait of His Royal Majesty King George III. She suggested it was best to let bygones be bygones, and in view of our two countries' remarkable friendship in succeeding years, she added that most Englishmen today would agree with Thomas Jefferson that ``a little rebellion now and then is a very good thing." [Laughter]

Well, from here I will go to Bonn and then Berlin, where there stands a grim symbol of power untamed. The Berlin Wall, that dreadful gray gash across the city, is in its third decade. It is the fitting signature of the regime that built it.

And a few hundred kilometers behind the Berlin Wall, there is another symbol. In the center of Warsaw, there is a sign that notes the distances to two capitals. In one direction it points toward Moscow. In the other it points toward Brussels, headquarters of Western Europe's tangible unity. The marker says that the distances from Warsaw to Moscow and Warsaw to Brussels are

equal. The sign makes this point: Poland is not East or West. Poland is at the center of European civilization. It has contributed mightily to that civilization. It is doing so today by being magnificently unreconciled to oppression.

Poland's struggle to be Poland and to secure the basic rights we often take for granted demonstrates why we dare not take those rights for granted. Gladstone, defending the Reform Bill of 1866, declared, ``You cannot fight against the future. Time is on our side." It was easier to believe in the march of democracy in Gladstone's day -- in that high noon of Victorian optimism.

We're approaching the end of a bloody century plagued by a terrible political invention -- totalitarianism. Optimism comes less easily today, not because democracy is less vigorous, but because democracy's enemies have refined their instruments of repression. Yet optimism is in order, because day by day democracy is proving itself to be a not-at-all-fragile flower. From Stettin on the Baltic to Varna on the Black Sea, the regimes planted by totalitarianism have had more than 30 years to establish their legitimacy. But none -- not one regime -- has yet been able to risk free elections. Regimes planted by bayonets do not take root.

The strength of the Solidarity movement in Poland demonstrates the truth told in an underground joke in the Soviet Union. It is that the Soviet Union would remain a one-party nation even if an opposition party were permitted, because everyone would join the opposition party. [Laughter]

America's time as a player on the stage of world history has been brief. I think understanding this fact has always made you patient with your younger cousins -- well, not always patient. I do recall that on one occasion, Sir Winston Churchill said in exasperation about one of our most distinguished diplomats: ``He is the only case I know of a bull who carries his china shop with him." [Laughter]

But witty as Sir Winston was, he also had that special attribute of great statesmen -- the gift of vision, the willingness to see the future based on the experience of the past. It is this sense of history, this understanding of the past that I want to talk with you about today, for it is in remembering what we share of the past that our two nations can make common cause for the future.

We have not inherited an easy world. If developments like the Industrial Revolution, which began here in England, and the gifts of science and technology have made life much easier for us, they have also made it more dangerous. There are threats now to our freedom, indeed to our very existence, that other generations could never even have imagined.

There is first the threat of global war. No President, no Congress, no Prime Minister, no Parliament can spend a day entirely free of this threat. And I don't have to tell you that in today's world the existence of nuclear weapons could mean, if not the extinction of mankind, then surely the end of civilization as we know it. That's why negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces now underway in Europe and the START talks -- Strategic Arms Reduction Talks -- which will begin later this month, are not just critical to American or

Western policy; they are critical to mankind. Our commitment to early success in these negotiations is firm and unshakable, and our purpose is clear: reducing the risk of war by reducing the means of waging war on both sides.

At the same time there is a threat posed to human freedom by the enormous power of the modern state. History teaches the dangers of government that overreaches -- political control taking precedence over free economic growth, secret police, mindless bureaucracy, all combining to stifle individual excellence and personal freedom.

Now, I'm aware that among us here and throughout Europe there is legitimate disagreement over the extent to which the public sector should play a role in a nation's economy and life. But on one point all of us are united -- our abhorrence of dictatorship in all its forms, but most particularly totalitarianism and the terrible inhumanities it has caused in our time -- the great purge, Auschwitz and Dachau, the Gulag, and Cambodia.

Historians looking back at our time will note the consistent restraint and peaceful intentions of the West. They will note that it was the democracies who refused to use the threat of their nuclear monopoly in the forties and early fifties for territorial or imperial gain. Had that nuclear monopoly been in the hands of the Communist world, the map of Europe -- indeed, the world -- would look very different today. And certainly they will note it was not the democracies that invaded Afghanistan or supressed Polish Solidarity or used chemical and toxin warfare in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia.

If history teaches anything it teaches self-delusion in the face of unpleasant facts is folly. We see around us today the marks of our terrible dilemma -- predictions of doomsday, antinuclear demonstrations, an arms race in which the West must, for its own protection, be an unwilling participant. At the same time we see totalitarian forces in the world who seek subversion and conflict around the globe to further their barbarous assault on the human spirit. What, then, is our course? Must civilization perish in a hail of fiery atoms? Must freedom wither in a quiet, deadening accommodation with totalitarian evil?

Sir Winston Churchill refused to accept the inevitability of war or even that it was imminent. He said, ``I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. But what we have to consider here today while time remains is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries."

Well, this is precisely our mission today: to preserve freedom as well as peace. It may not be easy to see; but I believe we live now at a turning point.

In an ironic sense Karl Marx was right. We are witnessing today a great revolutionary crisis, a crisis where the demands of the economic order are conflicting directly with those of the political order. But the crisis is happening not in the free, non-Marxist West, but in the home of Marxist-Leninism, the Soviet Union. It is the Soviet Union that runs against the tide of history by denying human freedom and human dignity to its citizens. It also is in deep

economic difficulty. The rate of growth in the national product has been steadily declining since the fifties and is less than half of what it was then.

The dimensions of this failure are astounding: A country which employs one-fifth of its population in agriculture is unable to feed its own people. Were it not for the private sector, the tiny private sector tolerated in Soviet agriculture, the country might be on the brink of famine. These private plots occupy a bare 3 percent of the arable land but account for nearly one-quarter of Soviet farm output and nearly one-third of meat products and vegetables. Overcentralized, with little or no incentives, year after year the Soviet system pours its best resource into the making of instruments of destruction. The constant shrinkage of economic growth combined with the growth of military production is putting a heavy strain on the Soviet people. What we see here is a political structure that no longer corresponds to its economic base, a society where productive forces are hampered by political ones.

The decay of the Soviet experiment should come as no surprise to us. Wherever the comparisons have been made between free and closed societies -- West Germany and East Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia, Malaysia and Vietnam -- it is the democratic countries what are prosperous and responsive to the needs of their people. And one of the simple but overwhelming facts of our time is this: Of all the millions of refugees we've seen in the modern world, their flight is always away from, not toward the Communist world. Today on the NATO line, our military forces face east to prevent a possible invasion. On the other side of the line, the Soviet forces also face east to prevent their people from leaving.

The hard evidence of totalitarian rule has caused in mankind an uprising of the intellect and will. Whether it is the growth of the new schools of economics in America or England or the appearance of the so-called new philosophers in France, there is one unifying thread running through the intellectual work of these groups -- rejection of the arbitrary power of the state, the refusal to subordinate the rights of the individual to the superstate, the realization that collectivism stifles all the best human impulses.

Since the exodus from Egypt, historians have written of those who sacrificed and struggled for freedom -- the stand at Thermopylae, the revolt of Spartacus, the storming of the Bastille, the Warsaw uprising in World War II. More recently we've seen evidence of this same human impulse in one of the developing nations in Central America. For months and months the world news media covered the fighting in El Salvador. Day after day we were treated to stories and film slanted toward the brave freedom-fighters battling oppressive government forces in behalf of the silent, suffering people of that tortured country.

And then one day those silent, suffering people were offered a chance to vote, to choose the kind of government they wanted. Suddenly the freedom-fighters in the hills were exposed for what they really are -- Cuban-backed guerrillas who want power for themselves, and their backers, not democracy for the people. They threatened death to any who voted, and destroyed hundreds of buses and trucks to keep the people from getting to the polling places. But on

election day, the people of El Salvador, an unprecedented 1.4 million of them, braved ambush and gunfire, and trudged for miles to vote for freedom.

They stood for hours in the hot sun waiting for their turn to vote. Members of our Congress who went there as observers told me of a women who was wounded by rifle fire on the way to the polls, who refused to leave the line to have her wound treated until after she had voted. A grandmother, who had been told by the guerrillas she would be killed when she returned from the polls, and she told the guerrillas, ``You can kill me, you can kill my family, kill my neighbors, but you can't kill us all." The real freedom-fighters of El Salvador turned out to be the people of that country -- the young, the old, the in-between.

Strange, but in my own country there's been little if any news coverage of that war since the election. Now, perhaps they'll say it's -- well, because there are newer struggles now.

On distant islands in the South Atlantic young men are fighting for Britain. And, yes, voices have been raised protesting their sacrifice for lumps of rock and earth so far away. But those young men aren't fighting for mere real estate. They fight for a cause -- for the belief that armed aggression must not be allowed to succeed, and the people must participate in the decisions of government -- [applause] -- the decisions of government under the rule of law. If there had been firmer support for that principle some 45 years ago, perhaps our generation wouldn't have suffered the bloodletting of World War II.

In the Middle East now the guns sound once more, this time in Lebanon, a country that for too long has had to endure the tragedy of civil war, terrorism, and foreign intervention and occupation. The fighting in Lebanon on the part of all parties must stop, and Israel should bring its forces home. But this is not enough. We must all work to stamp out the scourge of terrorism that in the Middle East makes war an ever-present threat.

But beyond the trouble spots lies a deeper, more positive pattern. Around the world today, the democratic revolution is gathering new strength. In India a critical test has been passed with the peaceful change of governing political parties. In Africa, Nigeria is moving into remarkable and unmistakable ways to build and strengthen its democratic institutions. In the Caribbean and Central America, 16 of 24 countries have freely elected governments. And in the United Nations, 8 of the 10 developing nations which have joined that body in the past 5 years are democracies.

In the Communist world as well, man's instinctive desire for freedom and self-determination surfaces again and again. To be sure, there are grim reminders of how brutally the police state attempts to snuff out this quest for self-rule -- 1953 in East Germany, 1956 in Hungary, 1968 in Czechoslovakia, 1981 in Poland. But the struggle continues in Poland. And we know that there are even those who strive and suffer for freedom within the confines of the Soviet Union itself. How we conduct ourselves here in the Western democracies will determine whether this trend continues.

No, democracy is not a fragile flower. Still it needs cultivating. If the rest of this century is to witness the gradual growth of freedom and democratic ideals, we must take actions to assist the campaign for democracy.

Some argue that we should encourage democratic change in right-wing dictatorships, but not in Communist regimes. Well, to accept this preposterous notion -- as some well-meaning people have -- is to invite the argument that once countries achieve a nuclear capability, they should be allowed an undisturbed reign of terror over their own citizens. We reject this course.

As for the Soviet view, Chairman Brezhnev repeatedly has stressed that the competition of ideas and systems must continue and that this is entirely consistent with relaxation of tensions and peace.

Well, we ask only that these systems begin by living up to their own constitutions, abiding by their own laws, and complying with the international obligations they have undertaken. We ask only for a process, a direction, a basic code of decency, not for an instant transformation.

We cannot ignore the fact that even without our encouragement there has been and will continue to be repeated explosions against repression and dictatorships. The Soviet Union itself is not immune to this reality. Any system is inherently unstable that has no peaceful means to legitimize its leaders. In such cases, the very repressiveness of the state ultimately drives people to resist it, if necessary, by force.

While we must be cautious about forcing the pace of change, we must not hesitate to declare our ultimate objectives and to take concrete actions to move toward them. We must be staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a lucky few, but the inalienable and universal right of all human beings. So states the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which, among other things, guarantees free elections.

The objective I propose is quite simple to state: to foster the infrastructure of democracy, the system of a free press, unions, political parties, universities, which allows a people to choose their own way to develop their own culture, to reconcile their own differences through peaceful means.

This is not cultural imperialism, it is providing the means for genuine self-determination and protection for diversity. Democracy already flourishes in countries with very different cultures and historical experiences. It would be cultural condescension, or worse, to say that any people prefer dictatorship to democracy. Who would voluntarily choose not to have the right to vote, decide to purchase government propaganda handouts instead of independent newspapers, prefer government to worker-controlled unions, opt for land to be owned by the state instead of those who till it, want government repression of religious liberty, a single political party instead of a free choice, a rigid cultural orthodoxy instead of democratic tolerance and diversity?

Since 1917 the Soviet Union has given covert political training and assistance to Marxist-Leninists in many countries. Of course, it also has promoted the use of violence and subversion by these same forces. Over the past several

decades, West European and other Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, and leaders have offered open assistance to fraternal, political, and social institutions to bring about peaceful and democratic progress. Appropriately, for a vigorous new democracy, the Federal Republic of Germany's political foundations have become a major force in this effort.

We in America now intend to take additional steps, as many of our allies have already done, toward realizing this same goal. The chairmen and other leaders of the national Republican and Democratic Party organizations are initiating a study with the bipartisan American political foundation to determine how the United States can best contribute as a nation to the global campaign for democracy now gathering force. They will have the cooperation of congressional leaders of both parties, along with representatives of business, labor, and other major institutions in our society. I look forward to receiving their recommendations and to working with these institutions and the Congress in the common task of strengthening democracy throughout the world.

It is time that we committed ourselves as a nation -- in both the public and private sectors -- to assisting democratic development.

We plan to consult with leaders of other nations as well. There is a proposal before the Council of Europe to invite parliamentarians from democratic countries to a meeting next year in Strasbourg. That prestigious gathering could consider ways to help democratic political movements.

This November in Washington there will take place an international meeting on free elections. And next spring there will be a conference of world authorities on constitutionalism and self-goverment hosted by the Chief Justice of the United States. Authorities from a number of developing and developed countries -- judges, philosophers, and politicians with practical experience -- have agreed to explore how to turn principle into practice and further the rule of law.

At the same time, we invite the Soviet Union to consider with us how the competition of ideas and values -- which it is committed to support -- can be conducted on a peaceful and reciprocal basis. For example, I am prepared to offer President Brezhnev an opportunity to speak to the American people on our television if he will allow me the same opportunity with the Soviet people. We also suggest that panels of our newsmen periodically appear on each other's television to discuss major events.

Now, I don't wish to sound overly optimistic, yet the Soviet Union is not immune from the reality of what is going on in the world. It has happened in the past -- a small ruling elite either mistakenly attempts to ease domestic unrest through greater repression and foreign adventure, or it chooses a wiser course. It begins to allow its people a voice in their own destiny. Even if this latter process is not realized soon, I believe the renewed strength of the democratic movement, complemented by a global campaign for freedom, will strengthen the prospects for arms control and a world at peace.

I have discussed on other occasions, including my address on May 9th, the elements of Western policies toward the Soviet Union to safeguard our interests and protect the peace. What I am describing now is a plan and a hope for the long term -- the march of freedom and democracy which will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash-heap of history as it has left other tyrannies which stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people. And that's why we must continue our efforts to strengthen NATO even as we move forward with our Zero-Option initiative in the negotiations on intermediate-range forces and our proposal for a one-third reduction in strategic ballistic missile warheads.

Our military strength is a prerequisite to peace, but let it be clear we maintain this strength in the hope it will never be used, for the ultimate determinant in the struggle that's now going on in the world will not be bombs and rockets, but a test of wills and ideas, a trial of spiritual resolve, the values we hold, the beliefs we cherish, the ideals to which we are dedicated.

The British people know that, given strong leadership, time and a little bit of hope, the forces of good ultimately rally and triumph over evil. Here among you is the cradle of self-government, the Mother of Parliaments. Here is the enduring greatness of the British contribution to mankind, the great civilized ideas: individual liberty, representative government, and the rule of law under God.

I've often wondered about the shyness of some of us in the West about standing for these ideals that have done so much to ease the plight of man and

the hardships of our imperfect world. This reluctance to use those vast resources at our command reminds me of the elderly lady whose home was bombed in the Blitz. As the rescuers moved about, they found a bottle of brandy she'd stored behind the staircase, which was all that was left standing. And since she was barely conscious, one of the workers pulled the cork to give her a taste of it. She came around immediately and said, ``Here now -- there now, put it back. That's for emergencies." [Laughter]

Well, the emergency is upon us. Let us be shy no longer. Let us go to our strength. Let us offer hope. Let us tell the world that a new age is not only possible but probable.

During the dark days of the Second World War, when this island was incandescent with courage, Winston Churchill exclaimed about Britain's adversaries, ``What kind of a people do they think we are?" Well, Britain's adversaries found out what extraordinary people the British are. But all the democracies paid a terrible price for allowing the dictators to underestimate us. We dare not make that mistake again. So, let us ask ourselves, ``What kind of people do we think we are?" And let us answer, ``Free people, worthy of freedom and determined not only to remain so but to help others gain their freedom as well."

Sir Winston led his people to great victory in war and then lost an election just as the fruits of victory were about to be enjoyed. But he left office honorably, and, as it turned out, temporarily, knowing that the liberty of his people was more important than the fate of any single leader. History recalls his greatness

in ways no dictator will ever know. And he left us a message of hope for the future, as timely now as when he first uttered it, as opposition leader in the Commons nearly 27 years ago, when he said, ``When we look back on all the perils through which we have passed and at the mighty foes that we have laid low and all the dark and deadly designs that we have frustrated, why should we fear for our future? We have," he said, ``come safely through the worst."

Well, the task I've set forth will long outlive our own generation. But together, we too have come through the worst. Let us now begin a major effort to secure the best -- a crusade for freedom that will engage the faith and fortitude of the next generation. For the sake of peace and justice, let us move toward a world in which all people are at last free to determine their own destiny.

Thank you.

Note: The President spoke at 12:14 p.m. in the Royal Gallery at the Palace of Westminster in London. Date 06/08/1982

On the previous evening, the President was greeted by Queen Elizabeth II in an arrival ceremony at Windsor Castle, near Windsor, England. Later, the Queen hosted a private dinner for the President.

On the morning of June 8, the President and the Queen spent part of the morning horseback riding on the Windsor Castle grounds.

President Reagan's, Evil Empire Speech

8 March, 1983

Thank you…[Applause]…Thank you very much…Thank you very much…[Applause subsides]…Thank you very much…and, Reverend Clergy all, and Senator Hawkins, distinguished members of the Florida congressional delegation, and all of you:

I can't tell you how you have warmed my heart with your welcome. I'm delighted to be here today.

Those of you in the National Association of Evangelicals are known for your spiritual and humanitarian work. And I would be especially remiss if I didn't discharge right now one personal debt of gratitude. Thank you for your prayers. Nancy and I have felt their presence many times in many ways. And believe me, for us they've made all the difference.

The other day in the East Room of the White House at a meeting there, someone asked me whether I was aware of all the people out there who were praying for the President. And I, had to say, "Yes, I am. I've felt it. I believe in intercessionary prayer." But I couldn't help but say to that questioner after he'd asked the question that–or at least say to them that if sometimes when he was praying he got a busy signal, it was just me in there ahead of him. [Laughter] I think I understand how Abraham Lincoln felt when he said, "I

have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go."

From the joy and the good feeling of this conference, I go to a political reception. Now, [Laughter] I don't know why, but that bit of scheduling reminds me of a story–[Laughter]–which I'll share with you:

An evangelical minister and a politician arrived at Heaven's gate one day together. And St. Peter, after doing all the necessary formalities, took them in hand to show them where their quarters would be. And he took them to a small, single room with a bed, a chair, and a table and said this was for the clergyman. And the politician was a little worried about what might be in store for him. And he couldn't believe it then when St. Peter stopped in front of a beautiful mansion with lovely grounds… many servants, and told him that these would be his quarters.

And he couldn't help but ask, he said, "But wait, how–there's something wrong–how do I get this mansion while that good and holy man only gets a single room?" And St. Peter said, "You have to understand how things are up here. We've got thousands and thousands of clergy. You're the first politician who ever made it." [Laughter and Applause]

But I don't want to contribute to a stereotype. [Laughter] So I tell you there are a great many God-fearing, dedicated, noble men and women in public life, present company included. And yes, we need your help to keep us ever mindful of the ideas and the principles that brought us into the public arena in

the first place. The basis of those ideals and principles is… a commitment to freedom and personal liberty that, itself is grounded in the much deeper realization that freedom prospers only where the blessings of God are avidly (mispronounces and corrects himself) sought and humbly accepted.

The American experiment in democracy rests on this insight. Its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers, voiced by William Penn when he said: "If we will not be governed by God, we must be governed by tyrants." Explaining the inalienable rights of men, Jefferson said, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And it was George Washington who said that "of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

And finally, that shrewdest of all observers of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, put it eloquently, after he had gone on a search for the secret of America's greatness and genius–and he said: "Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and the genius of America. America is good. And if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great." [Applause]

Well, I'm… [Applause] ..Well, I'm pleased to be here today with you who are keeping America great by keeping her good. Only through your work and prayers and those of millions of others can we hope to survive this perilous century and keep alive this experiment in liberty, this last, best hope of man.

I want you to know that this administration is motivated by a political philosophy that sees the greatness of America in you, her people, and in your families, churches, neighborhoods, communities–the institutions that foster and nourish values like concern for others and respect for the rule of law under God.

Now, I don't have to tell you that this puts us in opposition to, or at least out of step with, a–a prevailing attitude of many who have turned to a modern-day secularism, discarding the tried and time-tested values upon which our very civilization is based. No matter how well intentioned, their value system is radically different from that of most Americans. And while they proclaim that they're freeing us from superstitions of the past, they've taken upon themselves the job of superintending us by government rule and regulation. Sometimes their voices are louder than ours, but they are not yet a majority. [Applause]

An example of that vocal superiority is evident in a controversy now going on in Washington. And since I'm involved, I've been waiting to hear from the parents of young America. How far are they willing to go in giving to government their prerogatives as parents?

Let me state the case as briefly and simply as I can. An organization of citizens, sincerely motivated, deeply concerned about the increase in illegitimate births and abortions involving girls well below the age of consent, some time ago established a nationwide network of clinics to offer help to these girls and, hopefully, alleviate this situation. Now, again, let me say, I do

not fault their intent. However, in their well-intentioned effort, these clinics decided to provide advice and birth control drugs and devices to underage girls without the knowledge of their parents.

For some years now, the federal government has helped with funds to subsidize these clinics. In providing for this, the Congress decreed that every effort would be made to maximize parental participation. Nevertheless, the drugs and devices are prescribed without getting parental consent or giving notification after they've done so. Girls termed "sexually active"–and that has replaced the word "promiscuous"–are given this help in order to prevent illegitimate worth/birth (quickly corrects himself) eh or abortion.

Well, we have ordered clinics receiving federal funds to notify the parents such help has been given. [Applause] One of the nation's leading newspapers has created the term "squeal rule" in editorializing against us for doing this, and we're being criticized for violating the privacy of young people. A judge has recently granted an injunction against an enforcement of our rule. I've watched TV panel shows discuss this issue, seen columnists pontificating on our error, but no one seems to mention morality as playing a part in the subject of sex. [Applause]

Is all of Judeo-Christian tradition wrong? Are we to believe that something so sacred can be looked upon as a purely physical thing with no potential for emotional and psychological harm? And isn't it the parents' right to give counsel and advice to keep their children from making mistakes that may

affect their entire lives? [Slight crescendo of voice and emphasis–Long Applause]

Many of us in government would like to know what parents think about this intrusion in their family by government. We're going to fight in the courts. The right of parents and the rights of family take precedence over those of Washington-based bureaucrats and social engineers. [Applause]

But the fight against parental notification is really only one example of many attempts to water down traditional values and even abrogate the original terms of American democracy. Freedom prospers when religion is vibrant and the rule of law under God is acknowledged. [Applause] When our founding fathers passed the First Amendment, they sought to protect churches from government interference. They never intended to construct a wall of hostility between government and the concept of religious belief itself. [Murmurs of agreement, Applause]

The evidence of this permeates our history and our government. The Declaration of Independence mentions the Supreme Being no less than four times. "In God We Trust" is engraved on our coinage. The Supreme Court opens its proceedings with a religious invocation. And the members of Congress open their sessions with a prayer. I just happen to believe the schoolchildren of the United States are entitled to the same privileges as [Continues over applause] Supreme Court Justices and Congressmen.

Last year, I sent the Congress a constitutional amendment to restore prayer to public schools. Already this session, there's growing bipartisan support for the amendment, and I am calling on the Congress to act speedily to pass it and to let our children pray. [Applause]

Perhaps some of you, read recently about the Lubbock school case, where a judge actually ruled that it was unconstitutional for a school district to give equal treatment to religious and nonreligious student groups, even when the group meetings were being held during the students' own time. The First Amendment never intended to require government to discriminate against religious speech. [Applause]

Senators Denton and Hatfield have proposed legislation in the Congress on the whole question of prohibiting discrimination against religious forms of student speech. Such legislation could go far to restore freedom of religious speech for public school students. And I hope the Congress considers these bills quickly. And with your help, I think it's possible we could also get the constitutional amendment through the Congress this year. [Applause]

More than a decade ago, a Supreme Court decision literally wiped off the books of fifty states, statutes protecting the rights of unborn children. Abortion on demand now takes the lives of up to one and a half million unborn children a year. Human life legislation ending this tragedy will someday pass the Congress, and you and I must never rest until it does. [Applause] Unless and until it can be proven that the unborn child is not a living entity, then its right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness must be protected. [Applause]

You…You may remember that when abortion on demand began, many, and indeed, I'm sure many of you, warned that the practice would lead to a decline in respect for human life, that the philosophical premises used to justify abortion on demand would ultimately be used to justify other attacks on the sacredness of human life–infanticide or mercy killing. Tragically enough, those warnings proved all too true. Only last year a court permitted the death by starvation of a handicapped infant.

I have directed the Health and Human Services Department to make clear to every health care facility in the United States that the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 protects all handicapped persons against discrimination based on handicaps, including infants. [Applause] And we have taken the further step of requiring that each and every recipient of federal funds who provides health care… services to infants must post and keep posted in a conspicuous place a notice stating that "discriminatory failure to feed and care for handicapped infants in this facility is prohibited by federal law." It also lists a twenty-four-hour; toll-free number so that nurses and others may report violations in time to save the infant's life. [Applause]

In addition, recent legislation introduced by–in the Congress–by Representative Henry Hyde of Illinois not only increases restrictions on publicly financed abortions, it also addresses this whole problem of infanticide. I urge the Congress to begin hearings and to adopt legislation that will protect the right of life to all children, including the disabled or handicapped.

Now, I'm sure that you must get discouraged at times, but there you've done better than you know, perhaps. There's a great spiritual awakening in America, a [Applause]…a renewal of the traditional values that have been the bedrock of America's goodness and greatness.

One recent survey by a Washington-based research council concluded that Americans were far more religious than the people of other nations; 95 percent of those surveyed expressed a belief in God and a huge majority believed the Ten Commandments had real meaning in their lives, and another study has found that an overwhelming majority of Americans disapprove of adultery, teenage sex, pornography, abortion, and hard drugs, and this same study showed a deep reverence for the importance of family ties and religious belief.

I [Applause]…I think the items that we've discussed here today must be a key part of the nation's political agenda. For the first time the Congress is openly and seriously debating and dealing with the prayer and abortion issues–and that's enormous progress right there. I repeat: America is in the midst of a spiritual awakening and a moral renewal. And with your biblical keynote, I say today, "Yes, let justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never-failing stream."

Now, [Applause]…obviously, much of this new political and social consensus I've talked about is based on a positive view of American history, one that takes pride in our country's accomplishments and record. But we must never forget that no government schemes are going to perfect man. We know that

living in this world means dealing with what philosophers would call the phenomenology of evil or, as theologians would put it, the doctrine of sin.

There is sin and evil in the world, and we're enjoined by Scripture and the Lord Jesus to oppose it with all our might. Our nation, too, has a legacy of evil with which it must deal. The glory of this land has been its capacity for transcending the moral evils of our past. For example, the long struggle of minority citizens…for equal rights, once a source of disunity and civil war is now a point of pride for all Americans. We must never go back. There is no room for racism, anti-Semitism, or other forms of ethnic and racial hatred in this country. [Long Applause]

I know that you've been horrified, as have I, by the resurgence of some hate groups preaching bigotry and prejudice. Use the mighty voice of your pulpits and the powerful standing of your churches to denounce and isolate these hate groups in our midst. The commandment given us is clear and simple: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." [Applause]

But whatever sad episodes exist in our past, any objective observer must hold a positive view of American history, a history that has been the story of hopes fulfilled and dreams made into reality. Especially in this century, America has kept alight the torch of freedom, but not just for ourselves, but for millions of others around the world.

And this brings me to my final point today. During my first press conference as president, in answer to a direct question, I pointed out that, as good Marxist-

Leninists, the Soviet leaders have openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is that which will further their cause, which is world revolution. I think I should point out I was only quoting Lenin, their guiding spirit, who said in 1920 that they repudiate all morality that proceeds from supernatural ideas–that's their name for religion–or ideas that are outside class conceptions. Morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of class war. And everything is moral that is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for uniting the proletariat.

Well, I think the refusal of many influential people to accept this elementary fact of Soviet doctrine illustrates an historical reluctance to see totalitarian powers for what they are. We saw this phenomenon in the 1930s. We see it too often today.

This doesn't mean we should isolate ourselves and refuse to seek an understanding with them. I intend to do everything I can to persuade them of our peaceful intent, to remind them that it was the West that refused to use its nuclear monopoly in the forties and fifties for territorial gain and which now pr-proposes 50 percent cut in strategic ballistic missiles and the elimination of an entire class of land-based, intermediate-range nuclear missiles. [Applause]

At the same time, however, they must be made to understand: we will never compromise our principles and standards. We will never give away our freedom. We will never abandon our belief in God. [Long Applause] And we will never stop searching for a genuine peace, but we can assure none of these

things America stands for through the so-called nuclear freeze solutions proposed by some.

The truth is that a freeze now would be a very dangerous fraud, for that is merely the illusion of peace. The reality is that we must find peace through strength. [Applause]

I would a-[Applause continuing]…I would agree to a freeze if only we could freeze the Soviets' global desires. [Laughter, Applause] A freeze at current levels of weapons would remove any incentive for the Soviets to negotiate seriously in Geneva and virtually end our chances to achieve the major arms reductions which we have proposed. Instead, they would achieve their objectives through the freeze.

A freeze would reward the Soviet Union for its enormous and unparalleled military buildup. It would prevent the essential and long overdue modernization of United States and allied defenses and would leave our aging forces increasingly vulnerable. And an honest freeze would require extensive prior negotiations on the systems and numbers to be limited and on the measures to ensure effective verification and compliance. And the kind of a freeze that has been suggested would be virtually impossible to verify. Such a major effort would divert us completely from our current negotiations on achieving substantial reductions. [Applause]

I, a number of years ago, I heard a young father, a very prominent young man in the entertainment world, addressing a tremendous gathering in California.

It was during the time of the cold war, and communism and our own way of life were very much on people's minds. And he was speaking to that subject. And suddenly, though, I heard him saying, "I love my little girls more than anything–" And I said to myself, "Oh, no, don't. You can't — don't say that." But I had underestimated him. He went on: "I would rather see my little girls die now; still believing in God, than have them grow up under communism and one day die no longer believing in God." [Applause]

There were…There were thousands of young people in that audience. They came to their feet with shouts of joy. They had instantly recognized the profound truth in what he had said, with regard to the physical and the soul and what was truly important.

Yes, let us pray for the salvation of all of those who live in that totalitarian darkness–pray they will discover the joy of knowing God. But until they do, let us be aware that while they preach the supremacy of the State, declare its omnipotence over individual man, and predict its eventual domination of all peoples on the earth, they are the focus of evil in the modern world.

It was C.S. Lewis who, in his unforgettable "Screwtape Letters," wrote: "The greatest evil is not done now…in those sordid 'dens of crime' that Dickens loved to paint. It is…not even done in concentration camps and labor camps. In those we see its final result, but it is conceived and ordered; moved, seconded, carried and minuted in clear, carpeted, warmed, and well-lighted offices, by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven cheeks who do not need to raise their voice."

Well, because these “quiet men” do not “raise their voices,” because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they’re always making “their final territorial demand,” some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses. But if history teaches anything, it teaches that simpleminded appeasement or wishful thinking about our adversaries is folly. It means the betrayal of our past, the squandering of our freedom.

So, I urge you to speak out against those who would place the United States in a position of military and moral inferiority. You know, I’ve always believed that old Screwtape reserved his best efforts for those of you in the Church. So, in your discussions of the nuclear freeze proposals, I urge you to beware the temptation of pride–the temptation of blithely … uh … declaring yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil.

I ask you to resist the attempts of those who would have you withhold your support for our efforts, this administration’s efforts, to keep America strong and free, while we negotiate–real and verifiable reductions in the world’s nuclear arsenals and one day, with God’s help, their total elimination. [Applause]

While America's military strength is important, let me add here that I've always maintained that the struggle now going on for the world will never be decided by bombs or rockets, by armies or military might. The real crisis we face today is a spiritual one; at root, it is a test of moral will and faith.

Whittaker Chambers, the man whose own religious conversion made him a witness to one of the terrible traumas of our time, the Hiss-Chambers case, wrote that the crisis of the Western world exists to the degree in which the West is indifferent to God, the degree to which it collaborates in communism's attempt to make man stand alone without God. And then he said, for Marxism-Leninism is actually the second-oldest faith, first proclaimed in the Garden of Eden with the words of temptation, "Ye shall be as gods."

The Western world can answer this challenge, he wrote, "but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom He enjoins is as great as communism's faith in Man."

I believe we shall rise to the challenge. I believe that communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last–last pages even now are being written. I believe this because the source of our strength in the quest for human freedom is not material, but spiritual. And because it knows no limitation, it must terrify and ultimately triumph over those who would enslave their fellow man. For in the words of Isaiah: "He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no…might He increased strength. But they that

wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary." [Applause]

Yes, change your world. One of our founding fathers, Thomas Paine, said, "We have it within our power to begin the world over again." We can do it, doing together what no one church could do by itself.

God bless you, and thank you very much. [Long Applause]

President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative

23 March, 1983

My fellow Americans, thank you for sharing your time with me tonight.

The subject I want to discuss with you, peace and national security, is both timely and important. Timely, because I've reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century, a decision I'll tell you about in a few minutes. And important because there's a very big decision that you must make for yourselves. This subject involves the most basic duty that any President and any people share, the duty to protect and strengthen the peace.

At the beginning of this year, I submitted to the Congress a defense budget which reflects my best judgment of the best understanding of the experts and specialists who advise me about what we and our allies must do to protect our people in the years ahead. That budget is much more than a long list of numbers, for behind all the numbers lies America's ability to prevent the greatest of human tragedies and preserve our free way of life in a sometimes dangerous world. It is part of a careful, long-term plan to make America strong again after too many years of neglect and mistakes.

Our efforts to rebuild America's defenses and strengthen the peace began 2 years ago when we requested a major increase in the defense program. Since then, the amount of those increases we first proposed has been reduced by

half, through improvements in management and procurement and other savings.

The budget request that is now before the Congress has been trimmed to the limits of safety. Further deep cuts cannot be made without seriously endangering the security of the Nation. The choice is up to the men and women you've elected to the Congress, and that means the choice is up to you.

Tonight, I want to explain to you what this defense debate is all about and why I'm convinced that the budget now before the Congress is necessary, responsible, and deserving of your support. And I want to offer hope for the future.

But first, let me say what the defense debate is not about. It is not about spending arithmetic. I know that in the last few weeks you've been bombarded with numbers and percentages. Some say we need only a 5-percent increase in defense spending. The so-called alternate budget backed by liberals in the House of Representatives would lower the figure to 2 to 3 percent, cutting our defense spending by $163 billion over the next 5 years. The trouble with all these numbers is that they tell us little about the kind of defense program America needs or the benefits and security and freedom that our defense effort buys for us.

What seems to have been lost in all this debate is the simple truth of how a defense budget is arrived at. It isn't done by deciding to spend a certain number of dollars. Those loud voices that are occasionally heard charging that the

Government is trying to solve a security problem by throwing money at it are nothing more than noise based on ignorance. We start by considering what must be done to maintain peace and review all the possible threats against our security. Then a strategy for strengthening peace and defending against those threats must be agreed upon. And, finally, our defense establishment must be evaluated to see what is necessary to protect against any or all of the potential threats. The cost of achieving these ends is totaled up, and the result is the budget for national defense.

There is no logical way that you can say, let's spend x billion dollars less. You can only say, which part of our defense measures do we believe we can do without and still have security against all contingencies? Anyone in the Congress who advocates a percentage or a specific dollar cut in defense spending should be made to say what part of our defenses he would eliminate, and he should be candid enough to acknowledge that his cuts mean cutting our commitments to allies or inviting greater risk or both.

The defense policy of the United States is based on a simple premise: The United States does not start fights. We will never be an aggressor. We maintain our strength in order to deter and defend against aggression -- to preserve freedom and peace.

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control. ``Deterrence'' means simply this: making sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United States, or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that

the risks to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.

This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works. But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed. It took one kind of military force to deter an attack when we had far more nuclear weapons than any other power; it takes another kind now that the Soviets, for example, have enough accurate and powerful nuclear weapons to destroy virtually all of our missiles on the ground. Now, this is not to say that the Soviet Union is planning to make war on us. Nor do I believe a war is inevitable -- quite the contrary. But what must be recognized is that our security is based on being prepared to meet all threats.

There was a time when we depended on coastal forts and artillery batteries, because, with the weaponry of that day, any attack would have had to come by sea. Well, this is a different world, and our defenses must be based on recognition and awareness of the weaponry possessed by other nations in the nuclear age.

We can't afford to believe that we will never be threatened. There have been two world wars in my lifetime. We didn't start them and, indeed, did everything we could to avoid being drawn into them. But we were ill-prepared for both. Had we been better prepared, peace might have been preserved.

For 20 years the Soviet Union has been accumulating enormous military might. They didn't stop when their forces exceeded all requirements of a legitimate defensive capability. And they haven't stopped now. During the past decade and a half, the Soviets have built up a massive arsenal of new strategic nuclear weapons -- weapons that can strike directly at the United States.

As an example, the United States introduced its last new intercontinental ballistic missile, the Minute Man III, in 1969, and we're now dismantling our even older Titan missiles. But what has the Soviet Union done in these intervening years? Well, since 1969 the Soviet Union has built five new classes of ICBM's, and upgraded these eight times. As a result, their missiles are much more powerful and accurate than they were several years ago, and they continue to develop more, while ours are increasingly obsolete.

The same thing has happened in other areas. Over the same period, the Soviet Union built 4 new classes of submarine-launched ballistic missiles and over 60 new missile submarines. We built 2 new types of submarine missiles and actually withdrew 10 submarines from strategic missions. The Soviet Union built over 200 new Backfire bombers, and their brand new Blackjack bomber is now under development. We haven't built a new long-range bomber since our B - 52's were deployed about a quarter of a century ago, and we've already retired several hundred of those because of old age. Indeed, despite what many people think, our strategic forces only cost about 15 percent of the defense budget.

Another example of what's happened: In 1978 the Soviets had 600 intermediate-range nuclear missiles based on land and were beginning to add the SS - 20 -- a new, highly accurate, mobile missile with 3 warheads. We had none. Since then the Soviets have strengthened their lead. By the end of 1979, when Soviet leader Brezhnev declared ``a balance now exists," the Soviets had over 800 warheads. We still had none. A year ago this month, Mr. Brezhnev pledged a moratorium, or freeze, on SS - 20 deployment. But by last August, their 800 warheads had become more than 1,200. We still had none. Some freeze. At this time Soviet Defense Minister Ustinov announced ``approximate parity of forces continues to exist." But the Soviets are still adding an average of 3 new warheads a week, and now have 1,300. These warheads can reach their targets in a matter of a few minutes. We still have none. So far, it seems that the Soviet definition of parity is a box score of 1,300 to nothing, in their favor.

So, together with our NATO allies, we decided in 1979 to deploy new weapons, beginning this year, as a deterrent to their SS - 20's and as an incentive to the Soviet Union to meet us in serious arms control negotiations. We will begin that deployment late this year. At the same time, however, we're willing to cancel our program if the Soviets will dismantle theirs. This is what we've called a zero-zero plan. The Soviets are now at the negotiating table -- and I think it's fair to say that without our planned deployments, they wouldn't be there.

Now, let's consider conventional forces. Since 1974 the United States has produced 3,050 tactical combat aircraft. By contrast, the Soviet Union has

produced twice as many. When we look at attack submarines, the United States has produced 27 while the Soviet Union has produced 61. For armored vehicles, including tanks, we have produced 11,200. The Soviet Union has produced 54,000 -- nearly 5 to 1 in their favor. Finally, with artillery, we've produced 950 artillery and rocket launchers while the Soviets have produced more than 13,000 -- a staggering 14-to-1 ratio.

There was a time when we were able to offset superior Soviet numbers with higher quality, but today they are building weapons as sophisticated and modern as our own.

As the Soviets have increased their military power, they've been emboldened to extend that power. They're spreading their military influence in ways that can directly challenge our vital interests and those of our allies.

The following aerial photographs, most of them secret until now, illustrate this point in a crucial area very close to home: Central America and the Caribbean Basin. They're not dramatic photographs. But I think they help give you a better understanding of what I'm talking about.

This Soviet intelligence collection facility, less than a hundred miles from our coast, is the largest of its kind in the world. The acres and acres of antennae fields and intelligence monitors are targeted on key U.S. military installations and sensitive activities. The installation in Lourdes, Cuba, is manned by 1,500 Soviet technicians. And the satellite ground station allows instant

communications with Moscow. This 28-square-mile facility has grown by more than 60 percent in size and capability during the past decade.

In western Cuba, we see this military airfield and it complement of modern, Soviet-built Mig-23 aircraft. The Soviet Union uses this Cuban airfield for its own long-range reconnaissance missions. And earlier this month, two modern Soviet antisubmarine warfare aircraft began operating from it. During the past 2 years, the level of Soviet arms exports to Cuba can only be compared to the levels reached during the Cuban missile crisis 20 years ago.

This third photo, which is the only one in this series that has been previously made public, shows Soviet military hardware that has made its way to Central America. This airfield with its MI - 8 helicopters, anti-aircraft guns, and protected fighter sites is one of a number of military facilities in Nicaragua which has received Soviet equipment funneled through Cuba, and reflects the massive military buildup going on in that country.

On the small island of Grenada, at the southern end of the Caribbean chain, the Cubans, with Soviet financing and backing, are in the process of building an airfield with a 10,000-foot runway. Grenada doesn't even have an air force. Who is it intended for? The Caribbean is a very important passageway for our international commerce and military lines of communication. More than half of all American oil imports now pass through the Caribbean. The rapid buildup of Grenada's military potential is unrelated to any conceivable threat to this island country of under 110,000 people and totally at odds with the pattern of other eastern Caribbean States, most of which are unarmed.

The Soviet-Cuban militarization of Grenada, in short, can only be seen as power projection into the region. And it is in this important economic and strategic area that we're trying to help the Governments of El Salvador, Costa Rica, Honduras, and others in their struggles for democracy against guerrillas supported through Cuba and Nicaragua.

These pictures only tell a small part of the story. I wish I could show you more without compromising our most sensitive intelligence sources and methods. But the Soviet Union is also supporting Cuban military forces in Angola and Ethiopia. They have bases in Ethiopia and South Yemen, near the Persian Gulf oil fields. They've taken over the port that we built at Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam. And now for the first time in history, the Soviet Navy is a force to be reckoned with in the South Pacific.

Some people may still ask: Would the Soviets ever use their formidable military power? Well, again, can we afford to believe they won't? There is Afghanistan. And in Poland, the Soviets denied the will of the people and in so doing demonstrated to the world how their military power could also be used to intimidate.

The final fact is that the Soviet Union is acquiring what can only be considered an offensive military force. They have continued to build far more intercontinental ballistic missiles than they could possibly need simply to deter an attack. Their conventional forces are trained and equipped not so

much to defend against an attack as they are to permit sudden, surprise offensives of their own.

Our NATO allies have assumed a great defense burden, including the military draft in most countries. We're working with them and our other friends around the world to do more. Our defensive strategy means we need military forces that can move very quickly, forces that are trained and ready to respond to any emergency.

Every item in our defense program -- our ships, our tanks, our planes, our funds for training and spare parts -- is intended for one all-important purpose: to keep the peace. Unfortunately, a decade of neglecting our military forces had called into question our ability to do that.

When I took office in January 1981, I was appalled by what I found: American planes that couldn't fly and American ships that couldn't sail for lack of spare parts and trained personnel and insufficient fuel and ammunition for essential training. The inevitable result of all this was poor morale in our Armed Forces, difficulty in recruiting the brightest young Americans to wear the uniform, and difficulty in convincing our most experienced military personnel to stay on.

There was a real question then about how well we could meet a crisis. And it was obvious that we had to begin a major modernization program to ensure we could deter aggression and preserve the peace in the years ahead.

We had to move immediately to improve the basic readiness and staying power of our conventional forces, so they could meet -- and therefore help deter -- a crisis. We had to make up for lost years of investment by moving forward with a long-term plan to prepare our forces to counter the military capabilities our adversaries were developing for the future.

I know that all of you want peace, and so do I. I know too that many of you seriously believe that a nuclear freeze would further the cause of peace. But a freeze now would make us less, not more, secure and would raise, not reduce, the risks of war. It would be largely unverifiable and would seriously undercut our negotiations on arms reduction. It would reward the Soviets for their massive military buildup while preventing us from modernizing our aging and increasingly vulnerable forces. With their present margin of superiority, why should they agree to arms reductions knowing that we were prohibited from catching up?

Believe me, it wasn't pleasant for someone who had come to Washington determined to reduce government spending, but we had to move forward with the task of repairing our defenses or we would lose our ability to deter conflict now and in the future. We had to demonstrate to any adversary that aggression could not succeed, and that the only real solution was substantial, equitable, and effectively verifiable arms reduction -- the kind we're working for right now in Geneva.

Thanks to your strong support, and bipartisan support from the Congress, we began to turn things around. Already, we're seeing some very encouraging

results. Quality recruitment and retention are up dramatically -- more high school graduates are choosing military careers, and more experienced career personnel are choosing to stay. Our men and women in uniform at last are getting the tools and training they need to do their jobs.

Ask around today, especially among our young people, and I think you will find a whole new attitude toward serving their country. This reflects more than just better pay, equipment, and leadership. You the American people have sent a signal to these young people that it is once again an honor to wear the uniform. That's not something you measure in a budget, but it's a very real part of our nation's strength.

It'll take us longer to build the kind of equipment we need to keep peace in the future, but we've made a good start.

We haven't built a new long-range bomber for 21 years. Now we're building the B - 1. We hadn't launched one new strategic submarine for 17 years. Now we're building one Trident submarine a year. Our land-based missiles are increasingly threatened by the many huge, new Soviet ICBM's. We're determining how to solve that problem. At the same time, we're working in the START and INF negotiations with the goal of achieving deep reductions in the strategic and intermediate nuclear arsenals of both sides.

We have also begun the long-needed modernization of our conventional forces. The Army is getting its first new tank in 20 years. The Air Force is modernizing. We're rebuilding our Navy, which shrank from about a thousand

ships in the late 1960's to 453 during the 1970's. Our nation needs a superior navy to support our military forces and vital interests overseas. We're now on the road to achieving a 600-ship navy and increasing the amphibious capabilities of our marines, who are now serving the cause of peace in Lebanon. And we're building a real capability to assist our friends in the vitally important Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf region.

This adds up to a major effort, and it isn't cheap. It comes at a time when there are many other pressures on our budget and when the American people have already had to make major sacrifices during the recession. But we must not be misled by those who would make defense once again the scapegoat of the Federal budget.

The fact is that in the past few decades we have seen a dramatic shift in how we spend the taxpayer's dollar. Back in 1955, payments to individuals took up only about 20 percent of the Federal budget. For nearly three decades, these payments steadily increased and, this year, will account for 49 percent of the budget. By contrast, in 1955 defense took up more than half of the Federal budget. By 1980 this spending had fallen to a low of 23 percent. Even with the increase that I am requesting this year, defense will still amount to only 28 percent of the budget.

The calls for cutting back the defense budget come in nice, simple arithmetic. They're the same kind of talk that led the democracies to neglect their defenses in the 1930's and invited the tragedy of World War II. We must not let that grim chapter of history repeat itself through apathy or neglect.

This is why I'm speaking to you tonight -- to urge you to tell your Senators and Congressmen that you know we must continue to restore our military strength. If we stop in midstream, we will send a signal of decline, of lessened will, to friends and adversaries alike. Free people must voluntarily, through open debate and democratic means, meet the challenge that totalitarians pose by compulsion. It's up to us, in our time, to choose and choose wisely between the hard but necessary task of preserving peace and freedom and the temptation to ignore our duty and blindly hope for the best while the enemies of freedom grow stronger day by day.

The solution is well within our grasp. But to reach it, there is simply no alternative but to continue this year, in this budget, to provide the resources we need to preserve the peace and guarantee our freedom.

Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation.

This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisers, including in particular the Joint

Chiefs of Staff, have underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on both sides.

One of the most important contributions we can make is, of course, to lower the level of all arms, and particularly nuclear arms. We're engaged right now in several negotiations with the Soviet Union to bring about a mutual reduction of weapons. I will report to you a week from tomorrow my thoughts on that score. But let me just say, I'm totally committed to this course.

If the Soviet Union will join with us in our effort to achieve major arms reduction, we will have succeeded in stabilizing the nuclear balance. Nevertheless, it will still be necessary to rely on the specter of retaliation, on mutual threat. And that's a sad commentary on the human condition. Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort. It will take years, probably decades of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks, just as there will be successes and breakthroughs. And as we proceed, we must remain constant in preserving the nuclear deterrent and maintaining a solid capability for flexible response. But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is.

In the meantime, we will continue to pursue real reductions in nuclear arms, negotiating from a position of strength that can be ensured only by modernizing our strategic forces. At the same time, we must take steps to

reduce the risk of a conventional military conflict escalating to nuclear war by improving our nonnuclear capabilities.

America does possess -- now -- the technologies to attain very significant improvements in the effectiveness of our conventional, nonnuclear forces. Proceeding boldly with these new technologies, we can significantly reduce any incentive that the Soviet Union may have to threaten attack against the United States or its allies.

As we pursue our goal of defensive technologies, we recognize that our allies rely upon our strategic offensive power to deter attacks against them. Their vital interests and ours are inextricably linked. Their safety and ours are one. And no change in technology can or will alter that reality. We must and shall continue to honor our commitments.

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies, I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term

research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles. This could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose -- one all people share -- is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it. As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you.

Ronald Reagan Address at the Brandenburg Gate Berlin

Delivered on June 12th 1987 in West Berlin

Thank you. Thank you, very much.

Chancellor Kohl, Governing Mayor Diepgen, ladies and gentlemen: Twenty four years ago, President John F. Kennedy visited Berlin, and speaking to the people of this city and the world at the city hall. Well since then two other presidents have come, each in his turn to Berlin.

And today, I, myself, make my second visit to your city. We come to Berlin, we American Presidents, because it's our duty to speak in this place of freedom. But I must confess, we're drawn here by other things as well; by the feeling of history in this city more than 500 years older than our own nation; by the beauty of the Grunewald and the Tiergarten; most of all, by your courage and determination. Perhaps the composer, Paul Linke, understood something about American Presidents. You see, like so many Presidents before me, I come here today because wherever I go, whatever I do: "Ich hab noch einen Koffer in Berlin" [I still have a suitcase in Berlin.]

Our gathering today is being broadcast throughout Western Europe and North America. I understand that it is being seen and heard as well in the East. To those listening throughout Eastern Europe, I extend my warmest greetings and the good will of the American people. To those listening in East Berlin, a special word: Although I cannot be with you, I address my remarks to you just

as surely as to those standing here before me. For I join you, as I join your fellow countrymen in the West, in this firm, this unalterable belief: Es gibt nur ein Berlin. [There is only one Berlin.]

Behind me stands a wall that encircles the free sectors of this city, part of a vast system of barriers that divides the entire continent of Europe. From the Baltic South, those barriers cut across Germany in a gash of barbed wire, concrete, dog runs, and guard towers. Farther south, there may be no visible, no obvious wall. But there remain armed guards and checkpoints all the same still a restriction on the right to travel, still an instrument to impose upon ordinary men and women the will of a totalitarian state.

Yet, it is here in Berlin where the wall emerges most clearly; here, cutting across your city, where the news photo and the television screen have imprinted this brutal division of a continent upon the mind of the world. Standing before the Brandenburg Gate, every man is a German separated from his fellow men. Every man is a Berliner, forced to look upon a scar.

President Von Weizsäcker has said, "The German question is open as long as the Brandenburg Gate is closed." Well today today I say: As long as this gate is closed, as long as this scar of a wall is permitted to stand, it is not the German question alone that remains open, but the question of freedom for all mankind.

Yet, I do not come here to lament. For I find in Berlin a message of hope, even in the shadow of this wall, a message of triumph.

In this season of spring in 1945, the people of Berlin emerged from their air raid shelters to find devastation. Thousands of miles away, the people of the United States reached out to help. And in 1947 Secretary of State as you've been told George Marshall announced the creation of what would become known as the Marshall Plan. Speaking precisely 40 years ago this month, he said:

"Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos."

In the Reichstag a few moments ago, I saw a display commemorating this 40th anniversary of the Marshall Plan. I was struck by a sign the sign on a burntout, gutted structure that was being rebuilt. I understand that Berliners of my own generation can remember seeing signs like it dotted throughout the western sectors of the city. The sign read simply: "The Marshall Plan is helping here to strengthen the free world." A strong, free world in the West that dream became real. Japan rose from ruin to become an economic giant. Italy, France, Belgium virtually every nation in Western Europe saw political and economic rebirth; the European Community was founded.

In West Germany and here in Berlin, there took place an economic miracle, the Wirtschaftswunder. Adenauer, Erhard, Reuter, and other leaders understood the practical importance of liberty that just as truth can flourish only when the journalist is given freedom of speech, so prosperity can come about only when the farmer and businessman enjoy economic freedom. The

German leaders the German leaders reduced tariffs, expanded free trade, lowered taxes. From 1950 to 1960 alone, the standard of living in West Germany and Berlin doubled.

Where four decades ago there was rubble, today in West Berlin there is the greatest industrial output of any city in Germany: busy office blocks, fine homes and apartments, proud avenues, and the spreading lawns of parkland. Where a city's culture seemed to have been destroyed, today there are two great universities, orchestras and an opera, countless theaters, and museums. Where there was want, today there's abundance food, clothing, automobiles the wonderful goods of the Kudamm.[1]

From devastation, from utter ruin, you Berliners have, in freedom, rebuilt a city that once again ranks as one of the greatest on earth. Now the Soviets may have had other plans. But my friends, there were a few things the Soviets didn't count on: Berliner Herz, Berliner Humor, ja, und Berliner Schnauze. [Berliner heart, Berliner humor, yes, and a Berliner Schnauze.[2]]

In the 1950s Khrushchev predicted: "We will bury you." But in the West today, we see a free world that has achieved a level of prosperity and wellbeing unprecedented in all human history. In the Communist world, we see failure, technological backwardness, declining standards of health, even want of the most basic kind too little food. Even today, the Soviet Union still cannot feed itself. After these four decades, then, there stands before the entire world one great and inescapable conclusion: Freedom leads to prosperity.

Freedom replaces the ancient hatreds among the nations with comity and peace. Freedom is the victor.

And now the Soviets themselves may, in a limited way, be coming to understand the importance of freedom. We hear much from Moscow about a new policy of reform and openness. Some political prisoners have been released. Certain foreign news broadcasts are no longer being jammed. Some economic enterprises have been permitted to operate with greater freedom from state control.

Are these the beginnings of profound changes in the Soviet state? Or are they token gestures intended to raise false hopes in the West, or to strengthen the Soviet system without changing it? We welcome change and openness; for we believe that freedom and security go together, that the advance of human liberty the advance of human liberty can only strengthen the cause of world peace.

There is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable, that would advance dramatically the cause of freedom and peace. General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization: Come here to this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate. Mr. Gorbachev Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!

I understand the fear of war and the pain of division that afflict this continent, and I pledge to you my country's efforts to help overcome these burdens. To

be sure, we in the West must resist Soviet expansion. So, we must maintain defenses of unassailable strength. Yet we seek peace; so we must strive to reduce arms on both sides.

Beginning 10 years ago, the Soviets challenged the Western alliance with a grave new threat, hundreds of new and more deadly SS20 nuclear missiles capable of striking every capital in Europe. The Western alliance responded by committing itself to a counterdeployment (unless the Soviets agreed to negotiate a better solution) namely, the elimination of such weapons on both sides. For many months, the Soviets refused to bargain in earnestness. As the alliance, in turn, prepared to go forward with its counterdeployment, there were difficult days, days of protests like those during my 1982 visit to this city; and the Soviets later walked away from the table.

But through it all, the alliance held firm. And I invite those who protested then I invite those who protest today to mark this fact: Because we remained strong, the Soviets came back to the table. Because we remained strong, today we have within reach the possibility, not merely of limiting the growth of arms, but of eliminating, for the first time, an entire class of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.

As I speak, NATO ministers are meeting in Iceland to review the progress of our proposals for eliminating these weapons. At the talks in Geneva, we have also proposed deep cuts in strategic offensive weapons. And the Western allies have likewise made farreaching proposals to reduce the danger of conventional war and to place a total ban on chemical weapons.

While we pursue these arms reductions, I pledge to you that we will maintain the capacity to deter Soviet aggression at any level at which it might occur. And in cooperation with many of our allies, the United States is pursuing the Strategic Defense Initiative research to base deterrence not on the threat of offensive retaliation, but on defenses that truly defend; on systems, in short, that will not target populations, but shield them. By these means we seek to increase the safety of Europe and all the world.

But we must remember a crucial fact: East and West do not mistrust each other because we are armed; we are armed because we mistrust each other. And our differences are not about weapons but about liberty. When President Kennedy spoke at the City Hall those 24 years ago, freedom was encircled; Berlin was under siege. And today, despite all the pressures upon this city, Berlin stands secure in its liberty. And freedom itself is transforming the globe.

In the Philippines, in South and Central America, democracy has been given a rebirth. Throughout the Pacific, free markets are working miracle after miracle of economic growth. In the industrialized nations, a technological revolution is taking place, a revolution marked by rapid, dramatic advances in computers and telecommunications. In Europe, only one nation and those it controls refuse to join the community of freedom. Yet in this age of redoubled economic growth, of information and innovation, the Soviet Union faces a choice: It must make fundamental changes, or it will become obsolete.

Today, thus, represents a moment of hope. We in the West stand ready to cooperate with the East to promote true openness, to break down barriers that separate people, to create a safer, freer world. And surely there is no better place than Berlin, the meeting place of East and West, to make a start.

Free people of Berlin: Today, as in the past, the United States stands for the strict observance and full implementation of all parts of the Four Power Agreement of 1971. Let us use this occasion, the 750th anniversary of this city, to usher in a new era, to seek a still fuller, richer life for the Berlin of the future. Together, let us maintain and develop the ties between the Federal Republic and the Western sectors of Berlin, which is permitted by the 1971 agreement.

And I invite Mr. Gorbachev: Let us work to bring the Eastern and Western parts of the city closer together, so that all the inhabitants of all Berlin can enjoy the benefits that come with life in one of the great cities of the world.

To open Berlin still further to all Europe, East and West, let us expand the vital air access to this city, finding ways of making commercial air service to Berlin more convenient, more comfortable, and more economical. We look to the day when West Berlin can become one of the chief aviation hubs in all central Europe.

With our French and British partners, the United States is prepared to help bring international meetings to Berlin. It would be only fitting for Berlin to

serve as the site of United Nations meetings, or world conferences on human rights and arms control, or other issues that call for international cooperation.

There is no better way to establish hope for the future than to enlighten young minds, and we would be honored to sponsor summer youth exchanges, cultural events, and other programs for young Berliners from the East. Our French and British friends, I'm certain, will do the same. And it's my hope that an authority can be found in East Berlin to sponsor visits from young people of the Western sectors.

One final proposal, one close to my heart: Sport represents a source of enjoyment and ennoblement, and you may have noted that the Republic of Korea South Korea has offered to permit certain events of the 1988 Olympics to take place in the North. International sports competitions of all kinds could take place in both parts of this city.

And what better way to demonstrate to the world the openness of this city than to offer in some future year to hold the Olympic games here in Berlin, East and West.

In these four decades, as I have said, you Berliners have built a great city. You've done so in spite of threats the Soviet attempts to impose the Eastmark, the blockade. Today the city thrives in spite of the challenges implicit in the very presence of this wall. What keeps you here? Certainly there's a great deal to be said for your fortitude, for your defiant courage. But I believe there's something deeper, something that involves Berlin's whole look and feel and

way of life not mere sentiment. No one could live long in Berlin without being completely disabused of illusions. Something, instead, that has seen the difficulties of life in Berlin but chose to accept them, that continues to build this good and proud city in contrast to a surrounding totalitarian presence, that refuses to release human energies or aspirations, something that speaks with a powerful voice of affirmation, that says "yes" to this city, yes to the future, yes to freedom. In a word, I would submit that what keeps you in Berlin is "love." Love both profound and abiding.

Perhaps this gets to the root of the matter, to the most fundamental distinction of all between East and West. The totalitarian world produces backwardness because it does such violence to the spirit, thwarting the human impulse to create, to enjoy, to worship. The totalitarian world finds even symbols of love and of worship an affront.

Years ago, before the East Germans began rebuilding their churches, they erected a secular structure: the television tower at Alexander Platz. Virtually ever since, the authorities have been working to correct what they view as the tower's one major flaw: treating the glass sphere at the top with paints and chemicals of every kind. Yet even today when the sun strikes that sphere, that sphere that towers over all Berlin, the light makes the sign of the cross. There in Berlin, like the city itself, symbols of love, symbols of worship, cannot be suppressed.

As I looked out a moment ago from the Reichstag, that embodiment of German unity, I noticed words crudely spray painted upon the wall, perhaps by a young Berliner (quote): "This wall will fall. Beliefs become reality."

Yes, across Europe, this wall will fall, for it cannot withstand faith; it cannot withstand truth. The wall cannot withstand freedom.

And I would like, before I close, to say one word. I have read, and I have been questioned since I've been here about certain demonstrations against my coming. And I would like to say just one thing, and to those who demonstrate so. I wonder if they have ever asked themselves that if they should have the kind of government they apparently seek, no one would ever be able to do what they're doing again. Thank you and God bless you all. Thank you.

Notes:

1) Exclusive shopping district in Berlin.

2) "Berliner Schnauze" is a standard expression used in Germany to describe the way people in and around Berlin talk to each other. Interestingly enough, the sound and choice of words among these folks is slightly ruder as compared to similar expressions found in other regions of Germany. "Schnauze" is the German word for "mouth of dogs" and is comparable to the word "snout".

History

The RCN and the Cuban Missile Crisis by Andrew Pye

In the fall of 1962 the world stood on the brink of nuclear war. The United States and the Soviet Union were engaged in a high stakes game of brinkmanship in which the outcome could be the annihilation of half the planet. President Kennedy had quarantined the island nation of Cuba as a response to Soviet nuclear missiles being stationed there. These missiles represented a very real threat to the security of the United States and to the security of the North American continent. For this reason, Canada could not help but become intimately involved with the crisis. Nevertheless, the Canadian reaction to the situation proved troublesome. Hampered by a myriad of political concerns, the Diefenbaker government delayed their support of Kennedy's actions. Consequently, the Canadian military was caught in a difficult position. Longstanding military agreements with the United States military called for the cooperation of both armed forces in the event of a crisis, especially if the security of the continent was threatened. Central to these agreements was the role that the Royal Canadian Navy (RCN) should play in such a crisis. However, because the RCN was precluded from any politically driven defense agreements such as the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD), it was in a peculiar position as to its proper response to American military alerts.

Because of the delicate political situation that surrounded the Canadian naval response to the Cuban Missile Crisis, official documents and histories are few and far between. As such, any history of Canadian naval action must rely extensively on first-hand sources such as memoirs and oral testimonies.

Because the history of the RCN's involvement in the Cuban missile crisis is largely an "un-official" history, these firsthand accounts provide valuable insights into the role this organization played during those tense weeks in 1962. Accordingly, this paper will explore the role that oral histories can play in constructing the history of the RCN during the Cuban Missile Crisis. That history, beginning with a discussion of Canadian-American relations, both political and military, will proceed to a discussion of the RCN and its anti-submarine tactics before concluding with a discussion of the crisis. Throughout the essay, the value of oral testimonies will be compared and contrasted to that of the secondary sources. The resulting account of the RCN in the Cuban Missile Crisis will show that the crisis was not a typical cold war crisis. Instead, the conflict lay in the fundamental disconnect between the military and the political institution.

Canadian-American Relations

Canadian-American relations were unique in that they operated on many different levels during the early Cold War. The nature of this relationship was summed-up by President Kennedy in a speech to the House of Commons in 1961: "Geography has made us neighbours. History has made us friends. Economics has made us partners. And necessity has made us Allies."[1] Kennedy was speaking to the natural circumstances in which the two countries found themselves. Being the only two countries in North America, Canada and the United States consequently developed numerous bilateral continental defense agreements. These agreements were both informal and formal. In the first case, agreements were informal in that they did not require political

consultation. Defense became a joint undertaking, with emphasis on mutual cooperation and understanding. In this situation, the military had a high level of operational authority in which to deploy their forces. The second level of this cooperation consisted of formal defense agreements such as NORAD and NATO. The underpinning context of these agreements was political consultation and sanction. Any and all action taken on behalf of these agreements would be the result of political decision making. Thus the framework for continental defense was a strange mixture of political and military authority.

Bilateral continental defense stemmed from earlier cooperation during the Second World War. The threat posed by the Germans forced Canadian and American planners to develop the Permanent Joint Board on Defense (PJBD), an organization that was continued after 1945 owing to the emergence of a Soviet threat. The PJBD was initially a forum for formal political consultation on matters of defense, but after the war a separate non-political identity was established in the form of the Military Cooperation Committee (MCC). The MCC subsequently developed a joint defense plan known as the Basic Security Plan (BSP), created in 1946. The BSP created a basic framework in which the military could maintain a high degree of operational autonomy. The result was that many service-to-service agreements covering joint surveillance, exercises, and other activities were created without political approval. Naturally these initial agreements grew into extensive plans and operations in which both militaries would prepare to act as a single operational entity.[2] Thus by 1962, an extensive continental defense framework had been created that was entirely separate from the political process. It was referred to

simply as the CANUS agreement and the RCN operated within this framework.

Retired Rear-Admiral Robert Yanow recalls this structure of bilateral defense. Having been a weapons officer aboard the HMCS Columbia during the crisis, Yanow was intimately involved with many aspects of Canadian-American cooperation. For Yanow, "cooperation with the US navy was outstanding."[3] The relationship between the navies allowed the seamless integration of forces, and Yanow remembers fondly the great deal of respect between the two forces.[4] These sentiments are shared by retired Vice-Admiral Nigel Brodeur, who was a weapons officer aboard the HMCS Kootenay during the crisis. Brodeur, for example, remembers the extensive training and joint tactical publications that came from the relationship. As a weapons officer, Brodeur was well versed in American rules of engagement and was thoroughly familiar with their tactical capabilities. Retired Rear-Admiral Robert Welland, who was Senior Canadian Commander Afloat during the crisis, agrees. The CANUS agreement, remarked Welland during an interview, was "mutually agreeable" which provided an excellent framework for joint operations. [5]

While the BSP created an informal network of continental defense plans, the signing of the NATO and NORAD agreements added a distinctly political element to Canadian defense policy. The experience of the Second World War and the growth of Soviet military capabilities convinced the Western Allies that an alliance structure was needed to maintain peace and stability. Consequently, in 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty was signed and NATO was

formed, and one of its founding principles was a commitment to "consultation before the use of force."[6] In this same spirit, a new Cold War doctrine of "crisis management" was created. The hope was that collective force, created by political consultation and used as a deterrent, would dissuade any aggressor from his aims, thus avoiding armed conflict. The theme of consultation was carried on into the negotiations of the NORAD agreement in 1957. For the United States, continental air defense was a necessary step to avoiding another Pearl Harbor. This meant that an effective continental air defense would depend on the ability for "rapid decision-making and the need for early military deployment."[7] In order to effectively implement this, use of Canadian airspace would be needed as the Soviets were now capable of delivering nuclear bombs via the Canadian Arctic. Consequently, Canadian participation in a joint air defense agreement was essential. However, this threatened a possible infringement on Canadian sovereignty and control of the country's foreign affairs. Canadian politicians therefore sought to maintain political control over the Canadian military by way of consultation agreements. Thus ,when the NORAD agreement was negotiated it was under the auspices of political process rather than operational coordination. Consequently, the necessity of NORAD was interpreted in different ways by the political and military establishments: "To the military it was a coordination agreement. To the politicians it was a consultation agreement."[8] By the outbreak of the Cuban Missile Crisis, Canadian-American military relations were typified by both cooperative military operations and formal political treaties. This created a complicated reality in which policy decisions were made.

The Royal Canadian Navy – ASW operations

The crux of the RCN's antisubmarine tactics was the "hunter-killer" task groups. These groups were generally made up of approximately five destroyers, and in the case of HMCS Bonaventure, an aircraft carrier. The latest Canadian destroyer was the 257, or Restigouche class. HMCS Columbia and HMCS Kootenay were both of this class. For Admiral Brodeur, the Kootenay had "good endurance, good speed, and good sea-keeping."[9] However, it was not without its flaws. One major flaw that sticks out for Brodeur was the performance of the forward mounted 3"70 gun. This fully automated gun was so troublesome for its operators, remarked Brodeur during interview, that even now he finds it somewhat "difficult to describe without getting somewhat obscene."[10] Furthermore, the 257's gunnery control system was plagued by an unreliable and "capricious" radar.[11] Brodeur attributes these problems to the newly introduced "user-maintainer" concept, which meant that those who operated the 3"70 and gunnery control systems were now expected to maintain it. This was problematic since the level of training that crewman had received was not consistent with the duties normally required of them. The flagship of the Atlantic fleet was the aircraft carrier HMCS Bonaventure. At the time of the crisis, it was loaded with 16 Tracker aircraft and seven helicopters. Through this aircraft capacity, the Bonaventure was able to search an area of roughly 400 square miles, and Admiral Welland remembers that four new aircraft were sent out every four hours.[12] This could be done continuously for two to three weeks as the RCN deployed its hunter-killer groups against a formidable Soviet submarine force.

In 1962, the Soviet threat during the Cold War had been growing in recent years. By the time of the Crisis, the Soviets had an estimated fleet of around 150 submarines, ranging from the newer "Foxtrot" class to the older "Golf" and "Zulu" classes. Brodeur speaks of the Foxtrot as a "very good conventional diesel electric submarine."[13] These submarines were quiet, making them increasingly hard to track. Moreover, they were manned by experienced and capable crew. All in all, Yanow concludes, "they were a real opponent,"[14] and Brodeur was quick to point out that in a torpedo shootout with a Soviet submarine, a Canadian destroyer would have lost.[15] The Soviets had also recently equipped their subs with nuclear missiles. These were not as advanced as the American "Nautilus" class missiles, however, as the Soviets still had to surface to fire their missiles. In addition to tracking possible Soviet submarine contacts, the RCN had to worry about Soviet fishing and merchant vessels. These vessels, under civilian guise, would often act as support ships for the Soviet navy by gathering intelligence and refuelling patrolling subs. The threat to the North American eastern seaboard therefore, was very real.

The role of the RCN during the crisis, therefore, consisted almost exclusively of assisting the USN with antisubmarine warfare. The Canadian Atlantic fleet consisted of five escort groups: the 9th, 7th, 3rd, 5th and the aircraft carrier HMCS Bonaventure's group. In conjunction with USN, the fleet was tasked with confronting Soviet submarines and monitoring Soviet fishing fleets and merchant vessels. The two navies, through years of bilateral cooperation, had developed an extensive antisubmarine program which utilized long range surveillance aircraft, sub-hunting escort groups, and underwater sonar systems. Bilateral defense agreements, meanwhile, had produced many

documents on joint tactical doctrine. The extensive training that resulted from this produced a very capable ASW navy, and Brodeur believes that the RCN was "as good as any, perhaps better than most"[16] at implementing this doctrine. An integral part of this doctrine was the role that aircraft played in anti-submarine warfare. Canadian Tracker and ARGUS aircraft worked alongside American Neptune planes to scan massive swaths of the Atlantic. The aircraft would fly out and drop a range of sonar buoys then attempt to track any potential contacts. The ARGUS aircraft were able to do this up to 24 hours at a time. If a contact was found, the information could be relayed to nearby ships. In addition to the ships and aircraft, continental defense plans employed the underwater Sound Surveillance System (SOSUS). These underwater listening posts, primarily positioned near Iceland and Great Britain, would track any Soviet subs and convey the information to waiting "hunter-killer" groups. All in all, the submarine screen deployed by the US and Canadian navies is described by all three sources and much of the existing literature as a formidable defense.

1962 – The Cuban Missile Crisis

On 14 October 1962, an American U2 spy plane flew over Cuba and detected the presence of medium-range nuclear ballistic missiles. The missiles had the capability to strike Washington, DC, Boston, and New York. President Kennedy was informed of the missiles two days later, at which time his circle of advisors, called ExComm, began deliberations and eventually decided to enact a naval quarantine around Cuba. This decision was made without consultation with US allies, who received notification of the quarantine only

a few hours before Kennedy's televised speech of October 22. In Canada, Ambassador Merchant Livingston flew to Ottawa and briefed Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, Minister of National Defense Douglas Harkness, and Secretary of State for External Affairs Howard Green on the situation. Shortly thereafter, the US military was put on DEFCON 3 and requested that the Canadian contingent of NORAD to do the same. Diefenbaker, for fear of escalation, refused and the Canadian military remained officially on standby. So begin the Cuban Missile Crisis in Canada.

The political realities of the crisis can be seen to be drastically different from the military demands. Diefenbaker and his cabinet theoretically had the power to determine where and when to use the Canadian military. It was up to the politicians to decide when to put the military on alert. Under the National Defense Act of 1951, the Minister of National Defense (MND) was responsible for the "control and management" of the armed forces,[17] and the minister in turn was responsible to the PM and the cabinet. Thus, when Kennedy's intentions became known and US military units went to DEFCON 3, Diefenbaker refused to follow suit. From the beginning, Diefenbaker distrusted Kennedy's motives and refused to give his immediate support. In his speech to the House of Commons following Kennedy's October 22 address, Diefenbaker stated "our duty is not to fan the flames of fear but to do our part to bring about relief from tensions."[18] In other words, the Prime Minister disapproved of putting the military on alert as he believed doing so would heighten tensions. Instead he favoured bringing the issue to the United Nations in order to "obtain a full and complete understanding of what is taking place in Cuba."[19] Nevertheless, some felt that the Canadian military needed to

fulfill its continental defense commitments and formally be placed on alert. Minister Harkness argued to this end. Diefenbaker relented only on October 24 after the US military went to DEFCON 2 – the highest degree of alertness short of actual hostilities.

Much criticism has been levelled at Diefenbaker for his actions in the crisis, particularly from the military. From a military standpoint, inaction in the face of immediate danger is unacceptable. Moreover, Diefenbaker's conduct illustrates a fundamental disconnect between the military and their political masters. Admiral Welland posits that Diefenbaker was "completely unprepared to deal with [the Crisis]"[20] and that his decisions during the crisis speak to his misunderstanding of the military realities. It is obvious that he did not appreciate the bilateral defense agreements, and thus did not see the need to mimic the American state of readiness. Furthermore, it was his duty Prime Minister to ensure the readiness and proper utilization of the armed forces. That was what he was expected to do as a leader. In Welland's eyes, he failed at this task.

Militarily, the situation was quite different; specifically, the very real naval threat that was growing in the Western and Northern Atlantic. The Soviet submarine threat had been growing since early September and on October 17 and 18 Rear-Admiral Ken Dyer, Maritime Commander Atlantic, met with his American counterparts to discuss the matter. The result of these discussions was an increased state of surveillance and readiness within the RCN. This was considered a routine action within joint defense agreements, and thus required no political approval. However, this was as far as Dyer could go without

political direction. When the American forces were elevated to DEFCON 3, Dyer was powerless to do anything. Then on October 23, Minister Harkness—without Diefenbaker's consent—ordered his chiefs of staff "to begin planning as if the alert had been declared, but to do so discreetly."[21] The Navy Chief of Staff, Admiral Rayner, relayed these orders. Dyer complied, increasing surveillance patrols and ordering his fleet to prepare for sea. He also sent Commodore Welland to England to take command of the aircraft carrier Bonaventure. However, even this response was not considered adequate as the USN had already begun extensive antisubmarine operations. Under bilateral defense agreements, however, the RCN was responsible for the antisubmarine screen in the northern part of the eastern seaboard. Much to everyone's dismay, the Atlantic fleet was not able to sail until October 25th, some three days after Kennedy had announced the situation to the world. Furthermore, the most important aspect of the Atlantic fleet, HMCS Bonaventure, would not reach Halifax until November 2. Nevertheless, the RCN eventually settled in to "long days of ocean surveillance,"[22] and began ASW operations.

While ASW operations during the Cuban Missile Crisis were necessary, they were largely inconclusive. This is the conclusion reached by all of the interviewees. Admiral Yanow recalls that nothing actually happened. On the Columbia, not one confirmed sub contact was made. All contacts either turned out to be either a "non-sub" or of the biological variety, such as a whale. Admiral Welland shares this conviction, admitting that there is hardly any evidence to conclude that Soviet Submarines were actively operating around the submarine screen. Welland was well positioned to make this observation, as he was the Senior Canadian Commander Afloat during the crisis. He

remarks that the Atlantic command was well aware of the 7-10 subs that were regularly operating in the north Atlantic. None of these, he says, were spotted during the crisis.

Welland believes that given the heightened pace of operations, these subs would have been easily detected had they been operating near the submarine screen. The successful deployment of an extensive anti-submarine screen had deterred any Soviet activity. Welland's observation contrasts in stark detail with what is explained in the secondary literature. Tony German, in his book, The Sea is at Our Gates (1990), confirms that there were a total of twenty-nine established submarine contacts.23 He pulls this data from various military records and personal interviews. The discrepancy between the two views can be explained simply by differing interpretations of events. Welland's theory—which he admits is pure conjecture in the absence of definitive proof—is that Soviet submarines were pulled back by Moscow in order to avoid war. Welland's explanation is given in an attempt to explain what he believes to be relative inaction on the part of the Soviet submarines. German, on the other hand, uses his evidence as justification for the importance the RCN played in the crisis. For him, the fact that so many contacts were established is proof that the RCN played an effective role in the crisis. Each explanation points to the success of the RCN's operations, albeit in different circumstances. While the importance of the RCN in effective continental defense should not be understated, the seriousness of the Soviet submarine threat during the Crisis should not be overstated.

The Royal Canadian Navy during the Cuban Missile crisis can be seen as having fulfilled its commitment to continental defense. The oral histories of the event reflect this statement by recounting in great detail the roles and responsibilities of the RCN during Cold War operations. This can be expected, as the sources are drawn from officers who served aboard ships during the crisis. Their usefulness can then be interrupted and evaluated according to their ability to explain the inner workings of the naval defense mechanism. That mechanism, built through years of joint operations with the US Navy, was meant to provide an effective and extensive anti-submarine screen in the North Atlantic. While the navy achieved this during the crisis, the oral history reveals that from a Canadian perspective, the immediate conflict was not so much with the Soviets as with the political policy that was suppose to guide the military in times of crisis. Diefenbaker's inaction and his hesitancy to deploy Canadian forces coupled with the relative inactive Soviet threat in the Atlantic suggests this is the case. The oral sources reveal that the RCN did its duty insomuch as it could in the absence of effective political direction. Diefenbaker had misunderstood the terms of the continental defense agreements, which clearly stipulated the need for Canadian involvement under the circumstances of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Diefenbaker's lack of action perplexed the military, whose commanders understood the bilateral agreements as a seamless system of transnational defense. Therein lay the real conflict of the Cuban Missile Crisis in Canada. The defense agreements, and the subsequent role of the Canadian military in those agreements, were interpreted differently by the military and the politicians. The role of the RCN during the crisis, therefore, serves to highlight this conflict through its operations in the defense of the continent.

References:

1) Peter Haydon, The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered (Toronto: Canadian Print co, 1993), 63.

2) Peter Haydon, The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered (Toronto: Canadian Print co, 1993), 70-71.

3) Yanow Interview, 26:42.

4) Yanow Interview, 36:55.

5) Welland Interview, 55:34.

6) Peter Haydon, The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered (Toronto: Canadian Printco, 1993), pg 52

7) Peter Haydon, The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered (Toronto: Canadian Printco, 1993), pg 53.

8) Ibid, pg77.

9) Brodeur Interview, 13:35.

10) 10 Brodeur Interview, 15:10.

11) Brodeur Interview, 17:00.

12) Welland Interview, 29:40.

13) Brodeur Interview, 27:40.

14) Yanow Interview, 20:10.

15) Brodeur Interview, 33:30.

16) Brodeur Interview, 35:28.

17) Peter Haydon, The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered (Toronto: Canadian Printco, 1993), pg 88.

18) Jocelyn Maynard Ghent, "Canada, the United States, and the Cuban Missile Crisis," The Pacific Historical Review 48, no. 2 (1979): pg 166.

19) Ibid, Pg 166

20) Welland interview, 1:10

21) Peter Haydon, The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered (Toronto: Canadian Printco, 1993), pg 128.

22) Peter Haydon, The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered (Toronto: Canadian Printco, 1993), pg 144.

23) Tony German, The Sea is at Our Gates (Toronto: McClelland &Stewart, 1990), pg 271.

Works Cited

Brodeur, Nigel. Interviewed by Andrew Pye. November 20, 2009.

Clarkson, Stephen. "Defense Policy: Myth and Reality." *Economic and Political Weekely 7,* no 39. (1972): 165-169.

Crosby, Anne, Denholm. "A Middle-Power Military in Alliance: Canada and NORAD." *Journal of*
Peace Research 34, no. 1. (1997): pp 37-52.

Divine, Robert. *The Cuban Missile Crisis.* Quadrangle Books, Chicago: 1971.

German, Tony. *The Sea is At Our Gates.* McClelland &Stewart, Toronto: 1990.

Ghent, Jocelyn, Maynard. "Canada, the United States, and the Cuban Missile Crisis." *The Pacific Historical Review 48,* no. 2. (1979): pp 159-184.

Haydon, Peter. *The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis: Canadian Involvement Reconsidered.* Canadian

Printco Limited, Toronto: 1993.

The Canadian Navy and the Cuban Missile Crisis. VHS. Written and Produced by Pat Ryan, Nigel Brodeur, and Pat Nixon. Policy Publishers, 2000.

Welland, Robert. Interviewed by Andrew Pye. December 6, 2009.

Yanow, Robert. Interviewed by Andrew Pye. November 18, 2009.

Analysis

North Korea sent 100 ballistic missiles to Russia: Ukraine

A Ukrainian defense intelligence unit said Pyongyang also sent military specialists to help Moscow.

[**Radio Free Asia**] Nov. 26, 2024 North Korea has sent more than 100 KN-23 and KN-24 ballistic missiles to Russia, along with military specialists, to support its war with Ukraine, said a Ukrainian defense intelligence unit, about a week after South Korean confirmed that the North had exported additional artillery systems to Russia.

North Korea has been suspected of sending weapons to Russia to support its invasion of Ukraine. The South said last month that North Korea had sent about 7,000 containers of suspected weapons to Russia over the last two months, bringing the total number of containers to 20,000.

"The aggressor state of Russia has received more than 100 such missiles from the DPRK. The enemy first used these weapons in the war against Ukraine at the end of 2023," said the Defence Intelligence of Ukraine.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, DPRK, is North Korea's official name.

"Along with the missiles, Pyongyang then sent its military specialists to Russia to service the launchers and participate in war crimes against Ukraine," the institution said.

The KN-23 and KN-24 are North Korean short-range ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads, known as Hwasong-11 variants.

900 km range 500 kg payload KN-23 launched from vehicle (Wiki)

The intelligence unit reported that the missiles, responsible for numerous civilian casualties, were discovered to contain components manufactured by foreign companies, including from Britain, China, Japan, Switzerland and the United States.

One missile was found to include a voltage converter produced in February last year, bearing the label of the British company XP Power.

The [Ukrainian] unit urged stricter controls on the export of such components.

The British arms watchdog Conflict Arms Research said in April it had analyzed 290 parts from a North Korean missile used by Russia against Ukraine and concluded that the missile was believed to be a North Korean short-range ballistic missile, either the KN-23 or KN-24.

At that time, the watchdog said it identified parts from companies based in the U.S., China, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Singapore, Switzerland and Taiwan.

In response to the report, a representative of a Japanese company, whose name and identification number were engraved on one of the missiles, told media that the item was "counterfeit," noting that the engraving style differed from that of the authentic product.

The Ukraine intelligence unit's report came about a week after South Korea's spy agency confirmed that North Korea had exported additional artillery ammunition and launchers to Russia.

"In addition to artillery missiles, North Korea has also exported 170mm self-propelled artillery and 240mm howitzers," said the National Intelligence Service, or NIS.

North Korean casualties

Ukraine's report also followed confirmation from South Korea's main security agency that it had "specific intelligence" that North Korean forces in Russia had suffered casualties.

The U.S. and South Korea have said that North Korean troops had been fighting against Ukrainian forces in Kursk. The U.S. has estimated more than 10,000 North Korean soldiers had been sent to Kursk and they had begun combat operations alongside Russian forces.

Neither Russia nor North Korea have confirmed the presence of North Korean troops.
Separately, media reported that 500 North Koreans and one high-level North Korean official had been killed in a Ukrainian attack with British missiles last week.

The U.S. Department of Defense said on Tuesday it couldn't independently confirm the reports.

"What we've said, you know, before is that they're in that region and certainly poised to engage the Ukrainians in combat," Deputy Pentagon Press Secretary Sabrina Singh told a briefing.

"But I can't confirm those reports that there have been casualties yet."

Russia Bans 'Child-Free Propaganda'

[Moscow] Nov 12 (Reuters) - Russia's lower house of parliament voted unanimously on Tuesday to ban what authorities cast as pernicious propaganda for a child-free way of life, hoping to boost a faltering birth rate.

Official data released in September put the birth rate at its lowest in a quarter of a century while mortality rates are up as Moscow's war in Ukraine rages on. The Kremlin called the figures "catastrophic for the future of the nation".

President Vladimir Putin, who has cast Russia as a bastion of "traditional values" locked in an existential struggle with a decadent West, has encouraged women to have at least three children, saying that will help secure the future of Russians. There are already financial and other incentives.

The law, expected to be swiftly approved by the upper house of parliament and Putin, joins other restrictions on free expression including a ban on content deemed to promote "non-traditional lifestyles" such as same sex relationships or gender fluidity, as well as on dissenting accounts of the conflict in Ukraine.

Authors of "child-free propaganda" will be subject to fines of up to 400,000 roubles ($4,100) for individuals, twice that amount for officials, and up to 5 million roubles ($51,000) for legal entities.

Some 599,600 children were born in Russia in the first half of 2024, which is 16,000 fewer than in the first half of 2023 and the lowest since 1999. The number of deaths jumped by 49,000. However, immigration jumped by 20%.

Estimates in the CIA's World Factbook put Russia among the 40 countries with the lowest birth rate in 2023 at around 9.22 per 1,000 population, slightly ahead of Germany on 9.02 but well behind China on 9.7 and the United States on 12.21.

"We are talking about protecting citizens, primarily the younger generation, from information disseminated in the media space that has a negative impact on the formation of people's personality," said Vyacheslav Volodin, chairman of the lower house and a senior Putin ally.

"Everything must be done to ensure that new generations of our citizens grow up centred on traditional family values."

Women Say Better Living Standards will Boost Birth Rates

But some women were sceptical.

Alina Rzhanova, a 33-year-old who lives in Yaroslavl, 250 km northeast of Moscow, was once determined not to have children but now has an eight-month-old son.

"People want children, but there's no money," she said. "That's why people are not having children. Not because someone somewhere wrote something."

In Moscow, Yana, a 40-year-old woman who said she did not want children and declined to give her surname because of the subject's sensitivity, said she too felt that ensuring decent living standards, particularly beyond the big cities, could help reverse the declining birth rate.

"People have children when they are confident in tomorrow. But when mortgage rates reach 20% a year, I don't think it's a good time to have unlimited children," she said.

"A child-free community is where people on the same wavelength discuss why they don't want children. Do they have the right to discuss it? They do.

"It's unlikely that a lot of young people will read it and say 'I don't want children either'."

($1 = 98 roubles)

Tradecraft

Russian Farmers Ditch Wheat for Other Crops after Heavy Losses

[**Moscow**] Reuters, Nov 20 - Russian farmers say they will sow less wheat after heavy losses this year, switching to more profitable crops such as peas, lentils, or sunflowers.

Such decisions will have direct implications for global wheat prices and inflation in major buyers like Egypt, as Russia is the world's top exporter of the grain. The trend represents a challenge for President Vladimir Putin's plan to expand exports and cement Russia's position as an agriculture superpower, giving it more international clout amid confrontation with the West over its actions in Ukraine.

The country's wheat harvest will decline to 83 million tons this year due to frosts and drought, down from 92.8 million tons in 2023 and a record 104.2 million tons in 2022. New forecasts point to a clouded outlook for next year as well.

Although Russia has been exporting wheat at a near record pace in the recent months, exports are expected to slow due to a bad harvest and export curbs aimed at containing domestic price growth, including an expected cut in export quota by two-thirds from January 2025.

At a farm in Siberia's Omsk region, which was hit by heavy rain during the peak of the harvesting season, farmer Maxim Levshunov takes advantage of a rare sunny day to collect what remains in the fields.

He chuckles as he picks up ears of wheat that sprouted early due to the moisture. Now, most of his crops are only suitable for animal feed, meaning the farm will receive a fraction of the price it had hoped for.

"We'll probably start moving away from wheat, cutting back as much as possible. So, we'll be thinking about what more profitable crops we can replace it with right now," Levshunov told Reuters.

As this year's harvesting campaign comes to an end, Russian farmers are assessing their losses from the exceptionally bad weather and considering their next steps amid falling profit margins for wheat, Russia's main agricultural export.

Winter wheat became the first victim as areas sown with it are set to shrink by 10% this year, the lowest since 2019, according to data from Rusagrotrans, Russia's flagship grain rail carrier.

"There are losses on each ton. The selling price does not cover the cost," said Arkady Zlochevsky, head of the Russian Grain Union industry lobby, predicting that Russia's 26% share of the global wheat trade will shrink.

More Profitable Crops

Agriculture Minister Oksana Lut joked that farmers might pray to Saint Ilya, the patron saint of weather in Russia, to improve conditions for winter crops.

The joke did not go down well with farmers, who are considering more pragmatic options.

Some say they have already decided to plant less wheat next year. Others are waiting to see how global wheat prices perform in the next few weeks before making a final decision.

"The profitability of grain crops is approaching zero. The company has reduced the volume of winter wheat sowing by 30%. There are two drivers now — soybeans and sunflower," said Dmitry Garnov, CEO of Rostagro Group, which owns land in the Penza and Saratov regions around the Volga River.

Rising costs of equipment and fuel, high export duties, a rising benchmark interest rate that hit 21% in October as the country's central bank fights inflation, and the removal of some agricultural subsidies have also eaten into profit margins.

"It is evident that in 2022-2024, the price has been practically the same, while the cost of grain production has increased by at least 28%," said Sergei Lisovsky, a member of the lower house of Russia's parliament from the Kurgan region.

Lisovsky argued that the high export duty for grains, introduced in 2021, as well as rising transportation costs for regions with no direct access to seaports, were also factors behind low margins.

"Therefore, as of today, farmers are not planting grain not because of the autumn drought, but because they are waiting to see what the price will be, and have not yet made a decision," Lisovsky added, referring to spring wheat sowing.

Niche Crops

In Russia's most fertile Krasnodar region, the profitability of wheat is still holding around 10%, but some large local farms are also pondering a change of strategy as droughts become more severe each year.

"It is gradually getting warmer in the south, and we need to think about changing the structure of the sowing areas for the future," said Yevgeny Gromyko, executive from Tkachev Agrocomplex, one of Russia's largest landowners, and a former deputy agriculture minister.

The niche crops have the potential to become new export success stories with Russia's allies among the BRICS countries, aiding the government in achieving Putin's goal of increasing agricultural exports by half by 2030.

Russia overtook Canada this year as the top peas exporter to China while regulators in India, the leading importer of lentils, used to make daal, a staple for millions of people, gave a green light to Russian imports.

Russia takes great pride in being the world's top wheat exporter, with the older generation recalling the food shortages of the Soviet era and the humiliating grain imports from Cold War foes like the United States and Canada.

However, for struggling farmers, it is declining profits, not global status, that matter most.

"Many farms that specialised exclusively in wheat crops have operated at a loss this year and will face very serious financial difficulties, potentially leading to bankruptcy," Levshunov said.

Was the USSR Producing Enough Food? by James David

U.S. Intelligence Community Monitoring of Soviet Agriculture during the Cold War

The inability of a nation to adequately feed its population can have major domestic and foreign repercussions. It can result in loss of popular support for the government and social unrest. Food shortages can also decrease output in other sectors of the economy, reduce agricultural exports that earn foreign exchange or serve as an instrument of foreign policy, and, if severe, can affect military readiness. The use of foreign exchange holdings to acquire foodstuffs from other countries can result in decreased purchases of other needed goods from abroad. Large purchases can disturb domestic markets in the exporting nations and disrupt international markets. Accordingly, foreign agriculture was one of many important economic intelligence targets for the United States during the Cold War. As was the case for virtually all political, military, and economic intelligence targets, the highest priority country was the USSR. [1]

Overview of Soviet Agriculture

In the Soviet economy, the government, not the market, determined the allocation of resources and what goods and services would be produced. A small group of top leaders comprising the Council of Ministers established the production goals for each sector of the economy. They were assisted by central planning bodies that provided the detailed schedules and resource allocations needed to achieve them. In the agricultural sector, the Council

established output goals for all crops and dairy and meat products and determined the total acreage to be used for each output. Industries supporting agriculture—such as fertilizers, pesticides, machinery, transportation, and food processing—each had their own production goals. During most of the existence of the USSR, heavy industry and defense production were the top priorities, and other sectors of the economy were left with whatever resources remained. Output goals and resource allocations were set forth in Five- or Seven-Year Plans, which were further broken down into yearly and quarterly Plans. Authorities often revised these during their lifetimes and issued numerous directives for every sector. The centralization of decision making required detailed instructions to the subordinate units on inputs into production and related issues. In turn, the subordinate units submitted lengthy statistical reports. [2]

The agricultural sector had three parts—collective farms, state farms, and privately managed plots. All land was owned by the state. Collective farms represented a pooling of the land and labor of many small peasant farms. Each worker was paid according to the amount and type of work performed, adjusted depending on several factors. The state exercised considerable control, while workers were paid fixed wages. Virtually all the production on collective and state farms went to the state. Collective and state farms accounted for over 95 percent of the sown area, with the balance in the private sector, consisting of families at collective and state farms that gardened small plots and owned livestock. Authorities limited the size of the plots and the number of livestock and, until 1958, took a share of the production. Despite its small size, the private sector contributed a major share of selected

vegetables and fruits. For this reason, the state permitted the non-socialist private sector to exist. [3]

The USSR had about one-sixth of the total land area of the world, with about 11 percent under cultivation. Most of this was in the “fertile triangle” that extended from Leningrad to Odessa to Lake Baikal. Growing seasons were short because of the country’s northern location. Annual precipitation in the farming regions, as well as irrigation, was significantly less than that of most comparable areas in the United States and other major agricultural nations. [4]

Wheat was the most important grain and food crop and was cultivated on more acreage than any other crop. Rye was another grain utilized for food. Small amounts of both were also used as livestock feed, seed, and by industry. Although hay and other forage crops normally provided a large amount of livestock feed, grains grown mostly for that purpose included barley, corn, and oats. Potatoes were the second most important food crop. Sugar beets were the only domestic source of sugar. Sunflower seed accounted for most of the edible vegetable oil. Cotton and flax were the leading fiber crops. [5]

Throughout the Cold War, agriculture proved to be one of the weakest sectors of the Soviet economy. A growing population for several decades after the war, the desire to satisfy export commitments and minimize imports and the goal to provide more and better food to the citizenry required steady increases in production. The output of crops and livestock products grew over the decades, but there were often large annual fluctuations or periods of little or no growth. Domestic production accounted for most of the food, feed, and

industrial crops consumed or used. Small amounts were exported to communist countries and, on occasion, other nations. Imports were initially low in the postwar period. However, with the increasing emphasis on improving the diet by providing more livestock products and the frequent inability of domestic production and reserve stocks to meet the demand for grain, imports began to increase significantly in the 1960s. [6]

Sources of and Production of Intelligence

In the United States, there was a massive reduction in the personnel and the budgets devoted to the armed forces, the State Department, and the succession of clandestine intelligence agencies that existed after World War II. As a result, almost all of the limited intelligence resources that remained initially were allocated toward higher priority political and military targets rather than economic targets. As additional personnel and funding was authorized beginning later in the decade, there was a slow but steady growth in the amount of raw economic intelligence acquired and the number of finished reports prepared and disseminated to users. National Security Council Intelligence Directive No. 2 from 1948 assigned collection responsibilities for economic intelligence to "each agency in accordance with its respective needs." The directive, however, did not task any agencies to produce specific types of economic intelligence. [7]

The State Department and, beginning in 1947, the CIA, did most of the limited collection and reporting that occurred in the immediate postwar period. The majority of reports were classified. In the CIA, the primary office for analysis

and preparing finished intelligence was initially the Office of Reports and Estimates, followed, beginning in 1950, by its successor, the Office of Research and Reports. The latter soon formed the Food and Agriculture Branch, staffed with agronomists and other experts, to analyze and publish finished intelligence on foreign agriculture. It retained that name under the new Office of Economic Research in 1967 and then became the Agricultural Assessments Branch in 1981 under the new Office of Global Issues. Various offices in the State Department performed the same tasks, including the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The Department of Agriculture overtly gathered data on foreign agriculture and published unclassified reports. Both the State Department and CIA established liaison with the department in the late 1940s, and these relationships grew in the following years. [8]

To improve the quantity and quality of economic intelligence, the National Security Council tasked the Director of Central Intelligence in 1950 to lead an interagency study on the subject. The report, issued early the following year, recommended that no specific allocation of responsibility be given to individual agencies but that an interagency Economic Intelligence Committee be formed to review requirements, coordinate the effort, and occasionally publish reports. The Intelligence Advisory Committee quickly established the new committee, and one of the groups formed under it was the Subcommittee on Agriculture. [9]

Director of Central Intelligence Directive 15/1, approved by the Intelligence Advisory Committee in 1954, assigned primary production responsibility for foreign "military-economic intelligence" to the Department of Defense, all

Sino-Soviet Bloc non-military economic intelligence to the CIA, and all non-military economic intelligence outside the Sino-Soviet Bloc to the State Department. All economic intelligence collected by an agency was to be shared with the one having primary production responsibility. Under this and subsequent authorities, the CIA assumed primary responsibility for the Soviet agricultural target during the remainder of the Cold War. [10]

U.S. intelligence agencies sought a wide range of intelligence about Soviet food production, including: information on its organization, governing policies, and directives; figures on the number of workers employed in the sector and the acreage devoted to each crop; information on crop health, weather conditions, output estimates, final production figures, and livestock numbers; data on the manufacture and employment of farm machinery, the production and use of fertilizers, pesticides and irrigation systems; and information on the development of improved seeds, the storage and transportation of foodstuffs, food processing, and exports and imports. [11]

U.S. agencies used several sources to obtain this information. Open-source intelligence (OSINT) was a major contributor throughout the Cold War. The Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) of the CIA and the British Broadcasting Corporation divided the monitoring and translating of Soviet radio broadcasts (and later television broadcasts) and freely exchanged all translations. The CIA's Foreign Documents Division, as well as the State Department and other agencies to a lesser degree, collected and translated Soviet newspapers, journals, economic reports, and other government publications. (The Foreign Documents Division became part of FBIS in

1967.) They also translated covertly acquired documents. These broadcasts and materials contained a wide range of important information, although the Soviets considered some data (such as the allocation of grains to various uses, reserve stocks held by the government, and losses in transportation and storage) to be state secrets and never released them. The routine publication of agricultural statistics was often delayed for many months. [12]

Analysts were skeptical of Soviet production figures because officials had a strong incentive to demonstrate that the state-established production goals were being met or exceeded. In the early 1950s, the CIA began generating its own grain production estimates based on weather data, sown acreage, and, within a few years, occasional direct observations of agricultural areas by Westerners. By the end of the decade, more detailed and systematic weather data and increased information on seeding, harvesting, and state procurements enabled more accurate estimates. Improved tools were developed in the following decades using computers that analyzed additional factors in generating increasingly precise estimates. [13]

Limited data was also acquired through HUMINT. State Department personnel, including the agricultural attaché, and U.S. defense attachés occasionally gathered intelligence on Soviet farming in meetings with Soviet officials, discussions with personnel from allied nations, and from Soviet media. Until the mid-1950s, though, Soviet travel restrictions prevented them from visiting agricultural regions. As a result, they had no opportunity to personally observe farms or talk with farmworkers. After the loosening of these travel restrictions, a small but growing number of delegations that often

included both U.S. officials and individuals from the private sector made visits to some of these regions. Although the visits were negotiated with and carefully monitored by the Soviet government, they provided the opportunity for personal observations and discussions with farmers and local agricultural officials. Under Project Wringer from the late 1940s to the mid-1950s, U.S. Air Force personnel obtained limited information during interrogations of refugees from the USSR and former Soviet POWs. CIA operatives obtained intelligence from a range of sources, including allied intelligence services and covertly acquired Soviet documents. [14]

Beginning in the 1970s, imagery intelligence (IMINT) acquired by photoreconnaissance satellites became an important source of information on Soviet agriculture. This was the result of CIA studies beginning in 1965 examining the value of aerial photography from U-2 reconnaissance aircraft in estimating crop yields in China. These started with overflights of selected wheat, rice, and sugar fields in the United States for which there was accurate data on yields. Of the various types of film used, color was found to be the best to determine crop vigor. The studies were later expanded to review the potential of photoreconnaissance satellites in this regard, as U-2s could not collect against the Soviet Union and had stopped overflying China in 1968. Several HEXAGON photoreconnaissance satellites that flew from 1971 to 1984 carried small amounts of color film and were the first to make a substantial contribution to intelligence on Soviet and Chinese agriculture. (Color imagery was also valuable against certain other targets.) Undoubtedly, digital imagery acquired by the KENNEN satellite series, first launched in

1976, and its successors also made a significant contribution. However, these programs are still classified, and no details are available. [15]

The CIA began to examine the value of multispectral imagery of Soviet and other foreign agricultural regions shortly after the launch of the first Earth Resources Technology Satellite by NASA in 1972. (The program was redesignated LANDSAT later in the decade as additional satellites were placed into orbit.) This was the first civilian remote sensing satellite and the first robotic satellite to carry a multispectral camera, which can detect wavelengths of light beyond the visible spectrum, such as infrared and ultraviolet. The review found that the imagery was very useful in assessing crop health, as well as soil moisture and nutrient levels. It appears that the CIA started regularly acquiring and using multispectral imagery to estimate grain production in 1974. Although details are not available, the imagery from LANDSAT and the classified photoreconnaissance satellites were not redundant, as each provided different but equally important data on crop conditions. [16]

Weather data on the USSR came from several sources. Both the U.S. Weather Service and the Air Force's Air Weather Service provided it to the CIA beginning in the late 1940s. The former initially furnished its monthly publication on worldwide weather, while the latter provided ten- and thirty-day precipitation totals, temperatures, and snow cover depth. As both organizations improved their collection and analysis, the data received by the CIA increased in quantity and quality. There was a category of communications intelligence (COMINT) designated Special Weather

Intelligence, which in the case of the Soviet Union probably targeted encrypted radio transmissions of the three military weather services. However, since the effort remains completely classified, it is not known exactly what weather data it acquired or whether CIA analysts had access to it. The introduction of weather satellites in the early 1960s provided additional information. From 1960 to 1965, NASA launched ten first-generation TIROS weather satellites. The second-generation NASA weather satellites reached orbit beginning in 1964, and later generations followed thereafter. Because NASA's spacecraft could not give timely and accurate information of the weather over the Sino-Soviet Bloc for the programming of photoreconnaissance satellite cameras, the National Reconnaissance Office initiated the Defense Meteorological Support Program to meet that requirement, launching the first generation of these satellites in 1962 and later generations beginning in 1965. Their data was classified until 1972, and it is unknown whether CIA analysts had access to it during this period. [17]

Intelligence Reporting on Soviet Agriculture

The first postwar Five-Year Plan for 1946-1950 aimed to rebuild the devastated economy. Its modest goals for agriculture called for a 10 percent increase in production over 1940. During this period, little collection or analysis on the agricultural sector took place because of the higher priority of other targets and scarce resources. Most of the small amount of finished intelligence disseminated to users only briefly summarized a HUMINT or OSINT report. This included entries in the Daily Summary, a brief description of the most important events around the world that the Central Intelligence

Group began preparing for the president and a small group of other top officials in early 1946. (The CIA assumed responsibility for it the following year.)

The agricultural goals of the first Five-Year Plan were not met, with the CIA and others only beginning to report on it in detail early in the next decade when they received additional collection and analytical resources. Grain output did not exceed the prewar level until 1952. (All output figures herein are official Soviet figures unless otherwise noted.) With a rapidly growing population (from roughly 170 million at the end of the war to over 200 million by 1950), per capita consumption of food decreased between 10 and 17 percent from prewar levels. The reasons for the failure to meet the goals were many, including unfavorable weather, the fact that the total sown area for all crops did not exceed the prewar level until 1951, slow delivery of farm equipment, and the compulsory mobilization of many farm youths for the industrial and transportation sectors that diverted much-needed labor. [18]

Much of the finished intelligence on Soviet agriculture beginning in the 1950s was set forth in CIA publications such as Research Aids, Provisional Intelligence Reports, Intelligence Memorandums, and Economic Intelligence Surveys. One set of National Intelligence Estimates published annually from 1953-1957 also briefly addressed agriculture as part of the larger treatment of the Soviet economy. (The CIA's Board of Estimates prepared these and sent them to the interagency Intelligence Advisory Committee for review and publication.) There were several briefings of the National Security Council by CIA officials, including one in 1954 on a Soviet decree criticizing agricultural

failures and lagging grain production and again in 1957 and 1959 on the food situation in the Sino-Soviet Bloc. Short summaries for the president and a few other top officials continued to be included in the Daily Summary and its successors, the Current Intelligence Bulletin and Central Intelligence Bulletin, as well as in other periodic publications with wider distributions. The Departments of Agriculture and State generated a much smaller number of reports. [19]

The Five-Year Plan for 1951-1955 set forth ambitious agricultural goals, including a 40 to 50 percent increase in grain production over 1950. However, little progress was made in the early years. Total agricultural output in 1953 was only three percent above the prewar level, and the daily caloric intake remained slightly below prewar levels. Shortages of meat, sugar, dairy products, and a few other foods were common. CIA grain estimates during this period generally were within five percent of the Soviet figures. [20]

After the death of Joseph Stalin in 1953, the new Soviet leader, Nikita Khrushchev, publicly acknowledged serious problems in the sector and placed a high priority on improving agriculture and the quantity and quality of the average diet. Authorities took numerous steps to achieve these objectives. In 1954, they initiated the New Lands program that developed farmland from virgin and long-fallow land in West Siberia and North Kazakhstan. However, the newly cultivated regions did not have ideal soil or weather and experienced declining productivity over the years. The program soon expanded the sown area for all crops by more than one-third over 1950, and it basically remained at that level for the remainder of the Cold War, as there

were few potentially productive areas left to develop. As part of this expansion, the cultivated area for wheat increased by over 50 percent (and for other grains by about 25 percent) within a few years, while the acreage for potatoes and other vegetables remained about the same. Other actions taken included stopping the campaign to end, and lowering taxes on, private plots, accelerating the use of machinery and fertilizers, providing more agricultural and livestock specialists, and revising the procurement system. These measures resulted in major increases in production for many crops, particularly in years that had exceptionally good weather. For example, the total grain output in 1955 set a record. A record for total agricultural production (including grain) was set three years later and represented a 50 percent increase over 1953. From 1954-1958, consumers experienced a small but steady growth in the quality of their diet, although it continued to rely heavily on potatoes and cereal products. [21]

Beginning in 1958, CIA grain output estimates were consistently lower than Soviet figures and by wider margins. For example, the CIA estimate for 1958 was 125 million metric tons while the Soviet Union reported 141 million metric tons. Over the next several years, analysts attributed the increasing variance in these numbers to the CIA's collection of more and better data and to increased falsification of output by Soviet officials. Additionally, the Soviets apparently began to report "bunker weight" (the weight including excess moisture, trash, dirt, and weeds) instead of "barn harvest" (the weight after cleaning and drying). Analysts believed that the latter was eight to eleven percent below the former. [22]

The Seven-Year Plan for 1959-1965 called for a 70 percent increase in gross agricultural output over 1958. From 1959-1963, however, annual production of grains and almost every other crop fell short of the record year of 1958. The per capita availability of most foods declined or remained stagnant, and there was no improvement in diet. Feed shortages throughout the country resulted in smaller numbers of livestock, and, coupled with price increases for meat, led to major protests in at least one region in 1962. Khrushchev and other leaders repeatedly criticized management of the sector. They quickly implemented an extensive reorganization of agricultural administration, planned major increases in fertilizer and farm machinery production, and expanded the use of irrigation. [23]

Grain output decreased even more in 1963 to 111 million metric tons per Soviet statistics (the CIA estimate was 92 million metric tons). The country imported more than four times as much grain (primarily wheat) than it had in any prior year, representing almost four percent of the total supply. Khrushchev publicly admitted that the imports were needed to avoid rationing. Canada was the largest supplier, but smaller amounts also came from several other countries (including the United States in its first postwar wheat exports to the USSR). Although there was no definitive intelligence on wheat reserves, analysts believed that they were probably low, and that the government was reluctant to draw them down further. Grain output increased by more than one-third in 1964, setting a record. Nevertheless, imports increased to almost six percent of the total supply demonstrating that the demand still exceeded domestic production. [25]

Leonid Brezhnev succeeded Khrushchev after the latter's ouster in 1964. Efforts continued to improve production and the quantity and quality of the diet, particularly raising meat consumption. The measures to accomplish this in the Five-Year Plan for 1966-1970 included using more fertilizers and pesticides, expanding irrigated and drained land, employing improved seed, increasing the supply and quality of feed and the use of vitamins and growth stimulants for livestock, and raising the earnings of farms and farmworkers. Good weather and implementation of many of these measures resulted in greater output for almost all crops and livestock products during most years of the Plan. To satisfy consumer demand for more meat, the share of all grains used for feed increased from one-third in 1966 to almost one-half in 1970. Large amounts of imports continued, ranging from two to five percent of the total supply. Notwithstanding a modest growth in the per capita consumption of meat, milk and milk products, eggs, vegetables, and fruits from 1965 to 1970, about two-thirds of the Soviet diet still consisted of grain and potatoes (compared to less than one-third in the United States). [25]

The Five-Year Plans during the 1970s continued placing the highest priority on providing a better diet. Wheat remained the principal grain, accounting for roughly one-half of all grain produced. However, there was a sizable shift from wheat to feed grains, with barley increasing its share of total grain production since the 1960s to about 25 percent since it usually provided greater yields than spring wheat. There was record grain production in 1970 and a good crop the following year. Unfavorable weather caused a decrease of more than nine percent in the output of all crops (including grains and potatoes) and of almost four percent in livestock products in 1972 over the

previous year. To avoid bread shortages and a major decrease in meat, milk, and dairy products, the Soviets imported a record amount of wheat, rye, corn, and soybeans. About two-thirds of the imports came from the United States. Soviet representatives spread out their purchases to not upset the markets and to avoid higher prices for their imports. However, in the United States the purchases eventually resulted in much higher prices for wheat and its products and substantial criticism of the government. Beginning in January of 1972, numerous CIA publications had forecast a poor harvest and predicted increased imports because analysts believed that Soviet reserves were low at a time when it needed more livestock feed and to provide sufficient livestock products. The Agency also quickly reported many of the domestic and foreign purchases the Soviets made. In contrast, the Department of Agriculture's unclassified reports did not predict a decrease in production until the early summer and did not forecast the increased demand for U.S. grain. [26]

The events led to an interagency study in 1973 under the National Security Council to improve forecasting of Soviet agricultural production, expected imports, and the export demand for U.S. crops the Soviets were purchasing. Among other things, it was to examine the potential role of imagery from NASA's Earth Resources Technology Satellite and classified photoreconnaissance satellites. There is no further information available on the study, but it undoubtedly recommended using imagery from both systems, since many subsequent CIA intelligence reports heavily relied on LANDSAT and, in the redacted portions, the classified photoreconnaissance satellites. Additionally, in the early 1970s, the CIA developed an improved computerized model to predict yields for each of the grain-growing regions

and estimate total grain output. The model, designated UPSTREET, generated estimates early in the growing season that could be further revised every ten days as new weather data was received. Although tests demonstrated the model had errors ranging from two to eight percent in estimating total grain output, it was more accurate than prior methods. The CIA apparently constantly improved the model and used it during the balance of the Cold War. [27]

Although the USSR had excellent harvests in the next two years, in each of those years the country still imported about one-third the amount as in 1973 because domestic production did not satisfy the demand. A dramatic fall in grain production occurred in 1975. The Ford administration suspended sales to the Soviet Union until an agreement was signed preventing disruption to U.S. markets and guaranteeing U.S. farmers a reasonable share of the Soviet market. A record of nearly 26 million metric tons of grain imports the following year helped remedy the shortage in part, with the United States providing almost two-thirds again. Nevertheless, there was still insufficient grain for livestock feed, and the herds had to be reduced. Grain output rebounded and set a record in 1978 with 237 million metric tons, but substantial imports were still made because demand was larger than domestic production. Total agricultural production also set a record that year. Modest growth in per capita consumption of meat, milk and milk products, eggs, vegetables, and fruit took place in the first half the decade and then essentially leveled off. [28]

A decrease in agricultural production in 1979 and in the following two years led to widespread discontent, particularly over the decline in supply of livestock products, fruits, and vegetables. There was increased black market activity, longer queues in stores, and occasional work stoppages. In 1981, imports of grain and meat reached a record 12 percent of the total farm product. Authorities established a temporary rationing system for meat and milk products that year. [29]

Brezhnev and other leaders publicly acknowledged major problems with the agricultural sector. They specifically noted rising consumer discontent with the diet and how the growth in disposable income along with the maintenance of stable prices were together causing demand for food to increasingly outstrip supply. There was significant crop waste and losses, they said, and low rural living standards made it difficult to retain younger workers. The Five-Year Plan for 1981-1985 set ambitious goals for increasing the output of all livestock products and crops throughout the decade, including a nearly 25 percent increase in the production of grain, vegetables, and fruits and an approximately 15 percent increase in livestock products. Brezhnev's Food Program, implemented beginning in 1982, was a comprehensive effort to improve the production, transportation, storage, and processing of food and thereby increase the quality of the average diet, decrease losses and waste, and cut imports. Among its many provisions were the reorganization of the management of food production, increased investment in the farm sector (production, transportation, storage, food processing, and agricultural machinery), increasing incentives for farm workers and managers, and new production goals for key foods. The CIA's September 1982 report on The

Brezhnev Food Program concluded that for several reasons the production goals would not be met and that the improvements in transportation, storage facilities, and food processing would take nearly a decade to materialize. [30]

Brezhnev died in 1982 and was succeeded by Yuri Andropov, Konstantin Chernenko, and finally Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985, but the Food Program remained in place. Gorbachev initiated several major economic reforms, including a major reorganization of the agencies governing agriculture and measures to increase the autonomy of farms and improving incentives. However, most had not been fully implemented by the time of the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. [31]

For unknown reasons, the Soviets did not disclose grain production and yield data for 1981 through 1985 until 1986. Nevertheless, using UPSTREET the CIA made accurate estimates each year when compared to the statistics released in 1986. As an example, for 1981 the CIA estimated 158 million metric tons, while the official Soviet figure released in 1986 was 158.2. The CIA estimate for 1984 was 178 million metric tons, and the official Soviet figure was 172.6. Additionally, the CIA began to make estimates for other major crops, such as potatoes, vegetables, sugar beets, and sunflowers. [32]

Agricultural output improved in 1982 and 1983 because of good weather and the impact of the Food Program. Combined with larger than normal imports of grain, meat, fruits, vegetables, vegetable oil, and sugar, food availability grew noticeably. Total production fell in 1984, and the following year a record of almost 55 million metric tons of grain was imported. Output of grain,

sunflower seeds, and livestock products increased modestly from 1985 through 1987 but for most other crops only grew slightly or declined. There was excess demand for food because of government policies that increased disposable income but kept retail food prices stable and low. By 1987, there were reports of shortages of some foodstuffs and an increase in the rationing of meat and butter. Production of most crops and livestock products fell slightly during the next two years. In 1990, the last year of the USSR, output grew noticeably, including the second largest wheat crop ever. Nevertheless, most of the Food Program targets were not met. [33]

Throughout the Cold War, Soviet agriculture suffered from major problems that numerous reforms and decrees never completely overcame. Despite adequately feeding its citizens in terms of caloric intake through domestic production and, beginning in the early 1960s, imports, it was never able to provide sufficient amounts of the high-quality foods they desired. [34]

For the references to the documents visit the website:
https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/briefing-book/cold-war-intelligence/2024-11-20/was-ussr-producing-enough-food?eType=EmailBlastContent&eId=28e35b70-9767-4a17-926b-a96afb69e8f1

Stagnant Grain Production in Russia by William Webster

[**New York**] The central bank rate in Russia as of today is about 21%. The accumulated food cost inflation rate in Russia since 2021 is the highest in the G20 and stands at over 35 %. The inflation rate in Russia at the present time is a national secret. If a Russian were to publish such data they woud be arrested and sent to a gulag. The inflation rate as of today is between 130 to 15%.

For much of the past five years President Putin has hidden away Russian grain production statistics and in particular data relating to the tonnage of export sale of Russian grain. It is part of Putin's efforts to make secret any national statistics – an effort that returns Russian to the era of Soviet mentality.

Based on data available in the public doman, it appears that Russian grain production is either stagmented or has declined over the past five years. Beginning at the earliest years of his time as Russian President, Putin's decision to use grain in his foreign diplomacy has taken millions of tonnes of grain out of the Russian domestic market and into export trade.

The stagnation or decline may have coincided with the wort of the Covid-19 epidemic.

With stagnant or declining production, it appears his decision to invade and occupy a large tract of Ukrainian agricultural was a strategy that was meant

to bring under his control enough additional grain production so as to guarantee a sufficient crop for Russian citizens while he continues to export grain as a way to build a Russian presence in the third world, as well as bring in foreign currency (mostly American dollars).

Having decided not to reduce grain exports, Putin decided on the age old strategy of going to war to secure access to additional grain stocks. His occupying of eastern Ukrainian grain producing lands and graineries has provided Russia with over $ 500 million worth of grain which ahs then been shipped illicitly in customers such as Syria, and several authoritarian regimes allied to Russia in Africa. This amounts to over 12 million tonnes as of the first twelve months of the conflict.

Russian grain exports have been a way to circumvent the trade sanctions and have brought in, in excess of $ 1 billion of illicit revenue, following Putin's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022.

In 2023 wheat production stood at 92.8 million metric tons (mmt). There has been a noticeable reduction in seed and grain production in Russia in 2024/2025. It appears that Russian wheat exports will be reduced by two-thirds in 2025 to insure sufficient wheat for domestic demands. This is expected to drive the international price of wheat up by between 3 and 5 %.

This is information provided by the US Department of Agriculture regarding Russian grain production in 2024 and 2025:

Wheat – Lower Production

{Nov 8 2024} Harvest Data Indicates Lower Production

Russia wheat production for marketing year 2024/25 is estimated at 81.5 million metric tons (mmt), down less than 1 percent from last month and 11 percent from last year. The estimate includes 57.5 mmt of winter wheat and 24.0 mmt of spring wheat. USDA crop production estimates for Russia exclude estimated output from Crimea, which is included for Ukraine. Total wheat yield is estimated at 2.91 tons per hectare (t/ha), down less than 1 percent from last month and 8 percent from last year. Total harvested area is estimated at 28.0 million hectares (mha), unchanged from last month and down 3 percent from last year.

Corn Production – Lower Production

Russia corn production for marketing year 2024/25 is forecast at 15.0 million metric tons, down 3 percent from last month and 10 percent from last year. Yield is forecast at 6.00 tons per hectare, down 3 percent from last month and 13 percent from last year. Harvested area is forecast at 2.5 million hectares (mha), unchanged from last month and up 4 percent from last year.

Sun Flower Seeds – Lower Production

Russia sunflowerseed production for marketing year (MY) 2024/25 is forecast at 16.5 million metric tons, down 3 percent from last month, 4 percent from

last year .... Yield is forecast at 1.74 tons per hectare, down 3 percent from last month, 6 percent from last year … Harvested area is forecast at 9.5 million hectares (mha), unchanged from last month.

Ref:
https://ipad.fas.usda.gov/cropexplorer/pecad_stories.aspx?regionid=rs&ftype=prodbriefs

Science and Technology

Nuclear War Should Require a Second Opinion …

In just five minutes an American president could put all of humanity in jeopardy. Most nuclear security experts believe that's how long it would take for as many as 400 land-based nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal to be loosed on enemy targets after an initial "go" order. Ten minutes later a battalion of underwater nukes could join them.

That unbridled power is a frightening prospect no matter who is president. Donald Trump, the current occupant of the Oval Office, highlights this point. He said he aspires to be "unpredictable" in how he might use nuclear weapons. There is no way to recall these missiles when they have launched, and there is no self-destruct switch. The act would likely set off a lethal cascade of retaliatory attacks, which is why strategists call this scenario mutually assured destruction.

With the exception of the president, every link in the U.S. nuclear decision chain has protections against poor judgments, deliberate misuse or accidental deployment. The "two-person rule," in place since World War II, requires that the actual order to launch be sent to two separate people. Each one has to decode and authenticate the message before taking action. In addition, anyone with nuclear weapons duties, in any branch of service, must routinely pass a Pentagon-mandated evaluation called the Personnel Reliability Program—a battery of tests that assess several areas, including mental fitness, financial history, and physical and emotional well-being.

There is no comparable restraint on the president. He or she can decide to trigger a thermonuclear Armageddon without consulting anyone at all and never has to demonstrate mental fitness. This must change. We need to ensure at least some deliberation before the chief executive can act. And there are ways to do this without weakening our military responses or national security.

This is not just a reaction to current politics. Calls for a bulwark against unilateral action go back more than 30 years. During the Reagan administration, the late Jeremy Stone, then president of the Federation of American Scientists, proposed that the president should not be able to order a first nuclear strike without consulting with high-ranking members of Congress. Such a buffer would ensure that actions that could escalate into world-destroying counterattacks would not be taken lightly. Democratic legislators recently introduced a law that would require not just consultation but congressional support for a pre-emptive nuclear attack. Whether or not that seems like the best check on presidential nuclear power is a matter for Congress.

We already know that second-check plans would not compromise American safety. Security experts used to worry that a hair-trigger launch was needed to deter a first strike by an enemy: our instant reactions would ensure that our opponent would feel catastrophic consequences of aggression. In the modern world, that is no longer the case. The U.S. has enough nukes in enough locations—including, crucially, our roving, nuclear-armed submarines—that nuclear strategists now agree it would not be possible to take out all of the nation's weapons with a first strike. The Pentagon, in a 2012 security

assessment, said the same thing. It noted that even in the unlikely event that Russia launched a pre-emptive attack on the U.S.—and had more nuclear capability than current international agreements allow for—it "would have little to no effect on the U.S. assured second-strike capabilities." That conclusion suggests that we will have ample firepower even if two or more people discuss how to use it.

We have come close to nuclear war in the past because of misidentified threats, including an incident in 1979 in which computers at a military command center in Colorado Springs wrongly reported the start of a major Soviet nuclear offensive. Ballistic and nuclear bomber crews immediately sprang into action. Crisis was averted only after satellite data could not corroborate the warning, and American forces finally stood down.

Taking the arsenal off high alert is an important step. But putting another check into the system—removing one person's unfettered ability to destroy the world—will create another essential, lasting safeguard for the U.S. and the planet.

First published in Scientific American Magazine Vol. 317 No. 2 (Aug. 2017), p. 8

OBEL
Obelisk Press
Vancouver
PRESS